

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. IX

NOVEMBER, 1938

No. 11

A Course in Lutheran Theology

(Continued instead of concluded)

People are saying that *De Servo Arbitrio* is a dangerous book. We have heard them rail against it, first, because of Luther's teaching on the *discretio personarum* (*Cur alii, alii non?*), and, secondly, because of his statements concerning the *Deus Absconditus*. Usually the warning against *De Servo Arbitrio* takes this third form: It teaches *Calvinistic determinism*. If this charge is well founded, our book could not serve as a handbook for a course in Lutheran theology. It is therefore necessary to examine this sinister charge at some length.

The charge is raised quite generally. It has become a commonplace among theologians that *De Servo Arbitrio* is infected with the predestinarian heresy. Some speak of it regretfully, many, however, in a rancorous spirit. Here are a few representative utterances. John F. Hurst: "Erasmus objected strenuously to Luther's predestinarianism. . . . The book was entitled *The Slavery of the Will* and affirmed such a predetermination of human action as would result in absolute philosophical fatalism." *History of the Christian Church*, II, pp. 112, 179.⁵¹) Dr. Dieckhoff of Rostock wrote

51) Some definitions: "Fatalism regards all events as the inevitable result of an immutable and resistless fate. Deistic determinism turns the affairs of the world over to invariable mechanical forces supposed to be resident in nature. Theological determinism ascribes every act and event to the sovereign and absolute decree of God." (J. Stump, *The Chr. Faith*, p. 85.) "Predestinarianism' is not of course, as many think and say ignorantly or malevolently, the doctrine of predestination which is clearly taught in Scripture but the system of Calvin, with the twofold predestination to sin and righteousness, to life and to death, to salvation and damnation, with its particular grace, redemption, and vocation, with its particular power of the means of grace, and with its irresistible and inamissible grace." (C. F. W. Walther, *Lehre u. Wehre*, 26, p. 66.) "Calvinism, which is not the Scriptural, Christian doctrine but a philosophical speculation, teaches that election is founded solely on the will of God and not also on Christ . . . and that it never was the will of God to

a treatise entitled *The Missourian Predestinarianism and the Formula of Concord*, in which he asserts that the Formula of Concord, in rejecting in the Second Article "the delirium of philosophers who are called Stoics, as also of the Manicheans," had Luther in mind. (See *Lehre u. Wehre*, 32, p. 193. Pieper, *Chr. Dogmatik*, II, p. 595.) Dr. Wilh. Walther also asserts that "the Formula of Concord did not accept Luther's teaching of the twofold predestination." (*Lehrbuch der Symbolik*, p. 305.) K. Zickendraht: "Luther schreitet fast unmerklich vom Gnadenmonergismus zum Determinismus mit der Konsequenz der Bewirkung des Boesen durch Gott fort." (*Der Streit zwischen Erasmus und Luther ueber die Willensfreiheit*, p. 7.) Theod. Harnack: "What Luther, and his age with him, did not sufficiently distinguish, that is, with regard to God the metaphysical and personal relation of God to the world and with regard to man the formal and real freedom of will, that forced him to adopt a deterministic world-view. The deterministic bias rules markedly in *De Servo Arbitrio*. Luther openly declared for absolute predestination." (*Luthers Theologie*, pp. 183, 187.) Luthardt: "The first purpose of Luther is to prove that man's sinful will is unable to do anything towards effecting his salvation; but he goes beyond that and teaches determinism: immutabilitur omnia facit et voluntati eius neque resisti neque eam mutari aut impediri potest." (Luthardt-Jelke, *Komp. d. Dog.*, p. 174. Cp. p. 224.) G. Aulén: "Alles hat seine Ursache in der goettlichen Aktivitaet. Damit fuehrt uns Luther zu der doppelten Praedestination. Gleich wie die Auserwaehlung ihren Grund im Gotteswillen hat, so auch die Verwerfung. Luther weicht hier nicht aus. Der Gedanke der doppelten Praedestination wird streng verfochten: Gott waehlt aus und 'verstockt.'" (*Das christliche Gottesbild*, p. 221.) J. Aberley: "On the subject of election Luther was as Augustinian as was

save all men, but that God absolutely ordained the majority of mankind to damnation and therefore to unbelief. . . . This characterizes what must be rejected as anti-Scriptural Calvinism, as absolute predestination." (Hoenecke, *Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik*, III, p. 34 f.) The following statement by J. B. Champion, who advocates synergism, may also serve to clarify the point under discussion: "The Deterministic Viewpoint in theology is utterly impersonal and unchristian. It is the fixity of Fate, the unalterable *kismet* of the Turk. In High Calvinism there is set forth the God of Will instead of the will of God. In this system God as much wills the reprobation of the damned as the salvation of the elect. He has no more regard for the integrity of personality than for a block of wood or stone. To hold otherwise, as Erasmus and Melancthon did, is to be Semi-Pelagian synergists. But synergism is merely the personal in God and man interacting with each other, which is the soul and process of all personal relations. It respects the self-determinating constitution which God Himself put into human personality. Extreme Calvinism leaves not an atom of foundation for human responsibility except to accept salvation or damnation as God may will, for all has been decided by unconditional predestination of irresistible decree." (*Personality and the Trinity*, p. 39.)

Calvin. Yet the vital difference between them lies here that Luther refers predestination to the secret counsels of the hidden God. . . . I would not be understood as committing myself to an acceptance of the entire theology of Luther. The distinction between the *Deus Revelatus* and the *Deus Absconditus*, as he develops it, seems too dualistic." (*The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Jan., 1934, pp. 37, 40.)

One finds the myth concerning Luther's predestinarian aberration repeated in circles where you would not look for it. E. H. Klotzsche, for instance, summarizes *De Servo Arbitrio* thus: "The bondage of the will is the consequence of the natural depravity of man; hence free will can never be predicated of man; God alone has a free will, and He ordains all things according to the counsel of His will (*absolute predestination*). Though the lost perish through the *unconditioned will* of God, this is right because God wills it. It is a matter of His secret will." (*History of Doctrines*, p. 180.) The *Journal of the Am. Luth. Conference*, November, 1937, p. 38: "With Luther the doctrine of election is the working out of the logic involved in justification by faith. At least in his younger days he went further on this point than Paul, as did also Augustine and Calvin." The *Lutheran Standard*, January 2, 1932, in a review of *The Bondage of the Will*: "Speaking broadly, we have in *De Servo Arbitrio* an example of 'high Augustinianism.'" And even K. Ermisch declares: "We list Wyclif as a teacher of absolute predestination. And so was Luther. There is no doubt about it. Neither his friends nor his foes deny that he believed in absolute predestination. In his earlier days, at any rate, Luther had made statements as strong as any made by Augustine or, later, by Calvin. . . . It is certainly noteworthy that the outgoing 16th century seems to favor synergistic tendencies and apparently emphasizes the self-determination of man. In Holland, Arminius put forth his semi-Pelagian views. Did this time witness a reaction to, and an emancipation from, the strict determinism as advocated by Calvin and Luther?" (*Predestination*, pp. 30, 32, 99.⁵²)

Weighty voices are spreading the myth. The standard encyclopedias speak of it as a fact. Meusel tells the students: "Everybody knows that there are passages in Luther's book *De Servo Arbitrio* which profess determinism." (Sub v. *Determinismus*.) And the *Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia* tells them: "Determinism is the common name for all those theories of the human will which represent it as absolutely determined by motives which lie entirely outside of it, thereby reducing its freedom to a mere

52) The scope of this treatise is indicated by statements like this: "We must not deny that there may be, and in some cases likely was, synergism at the bottom of the *intuitu fidei* doctrine." (P.101.)

delusion. There is a dogmatic determinism, which, in order to glorify the majesty of God, excludes all other causality from human action but God Himself (Luther, *De Servo Arbitrio*); and there is a philosophical determinism which," etc. The introduction to *De Servo Arbitrio* in the Weimar edition (18, p. 595) says with Koestlin-Kawerau: "Luther is here compelled to go even beyond Paul in Rom. 9 ff."

It is an old story. Melanchthon was one of those that started it. "Melanchthon could not join in Luther's delirious outbursts against Erasmus. Luther was wrong in preaching predestination and writing that inopportune, violent, and dangerous tract on the subject against Erasmus. He was wrong to repudiate free will. . . . Melanchthon restores to the human will and human cooperation their dignity as a means of salvation. As the theologians say, he becomes (or rebecomes) a synergist. . . . He saw men swayed by egotism and evil passions, interpreting the doctrine of justification through faith and salvation by divine grace as their fancy directed. To what end should they struggle, toil to make themselves better, do good? Why not just wait, without curbing the instincts or resisting the promptings of evil? God would intervene and accomplish the good which man is impotent to accomplish himself. Here Melanchthon took fright and reacted." (L. Febvre, *Martin Luther*, p. 296 f.) See page 242 of the current volume of *C. T. M.* Read again also the statement of Koeberle: "Melanchthon and the Philippists were already afraid that as a result of Luther's harsh deterministic statements concerning the bondage of the will ('the condemnation of those who have not deserved it') the practical-ethical side of faith as an inner decision might be lost. So his followers formulated, with the greatest caution, the teaching *de tribus causis efficientibus, concurrentibus in conversione hominis non renati*." (*The Quest for Holiness*, p. 140.)

Does *De Servo Arbitrio* teach predestinarianism, dogmatic determinism? Melanchthon says so. Luthardt says so, and ten thousand others say so. What are the facts in the case? In the first place, does our book teach or deny universal grace? Calvin denies universal grace. The denial of universal grace is the most essential feature of Calvinism, predestinarianism. You cannot be a Calvinist if you believe and teach that God would have all men to be saved. Now examine the quotations from *De Servo Arbitrio* given on pages 493-495 above. Look them up in their context and see how often and how strongly Luther emphasizes the universality of grace. "Luther fairly revels in such texts." "The meaning of John [John 7:12] is this, that by the coming of Christ into the world, by His Gospel, by which grace was offered but not works required, a full opportunity was given to all men of becoming

the sons of God." (P. 198 f. St. L. XVIII, 1815.) Could the man who wrote this believe at the same time that God predestined a portion of mankind to damnation? Dr. Pieper knows of no writing of Luther in which he so often and so forcefully inculcates the truth that *every sinner* should confidently lay hold of, and rely on, the *revealed* God, the God Incarnate, as in *De Servo Arbitrio*, and he quotes this passage: "The God Incarnate [that is, God in Christ and in the means of grace] was sent for this purpose, that He might desire, speak, do, suffer, and offer unto all all things that are necessary unto salvation. (P. 187. St. L. XVIII, 1802. — See *Chr. Dogmatik*, II, p. 595.) An article in *Lehre und Wehre*, 17, p. 161 ff., shows that Luther never, not even before 1527 (since which year Luther is supposed to have discarded his predestinarian teaching) taught particular grace. Quotations are given from the years up to 1525, and then the writer says: "Even in his book *De Servo Arbitrio* Luther states, just to give one quotation: 'The righteous God does not deplore that death of His people which He Himself works in them; but He deplores that death which He finds in His people and which He desires to remove from them. For God Preached desires this, that, our sin and death being taken away, we might be saved.... He desires that all men should be saved, seeing that He comes unto all by the Word of salvation.'" (P. 172 f. — XVIII, 1795.) The writer adds: "It will be seen that Luther never taught particularism. He never was a Calvinist." Study Calvin's *Institutes*, count the passages in which he denounces the Lutheran teaching on universal grace, and then tell us what you think of a man who puts Luther and Calvin in the same class. Calvin would vehemently protest against admitting Luther into his class of students. Luther, the preacher of universal grace, did not know the a-b-c of Calvinism. No, you cannot make Luther out to be a Calvinist. You will find statements in *De Servo Arbitrio* which at first blush look something like things that Augustine and Calvin wrote, and you may be tempted to speak of "high Augustinianism." But in the light of Luther's strong universal-grace statements you will have to declare with the writer in the *Lutheran Standard* whom we quoted above: "And yet, even those statements in this writing that contain the strongest expression of determinism must be read with the knowledge that Luther at all times clung to the universality of grace and the objective efficacy of the means of grace. Hence statements in Luther's mouth on the sovereign will of God determining all things appear in a different light than would the same statements in the mouth of Calvin." You will have to agree with Rohnert, who states: "Zwar laesst es sich nicht leugnen, dass Luther in seiner Schrift *De Servo Arbitrio* von 1525 Ausdruecke gebraucht, welche fast an einen Determinismus anklingen. Dort sagt er u. a.: Immutabiliter omnia facit et voluntati eius neque

resisti neque eam mutari aut impediri potest. . . ." But after an exhaustive investigation of Luther's teaching he declares: "Nein, der Mann, welcher wie kein zweiter auf der Rechtfertigungslehre stand, der so entschieden die Allgemeinheit der Gnade und die Objektivitaet der Gnadenmittel betonte, der lebenslang die Irrlehren der Schweizer bekaempfte, kann niemals deterministisch gelehrt haben." (*Die Dogm. d. Ev.-Luth. Kirche*, p. 241 f.)

In the second place, what is, according to Calvinism, the ultimate, the real, reason why some are lost? God's eternal decree of reprobation. What is, according to Luther, the real reason? "God desires that all men should be saved, seeing that He comes unto all by the Word of salvation, and it is the fault of the will which does not receive Him, as He saith: 'How often would I have gathered thy children together, . . . and ye would not!' Matt. 23:37." (P. 173.) "The God Incarnate, then, here speaks thus, 'I would, and thou wouldst not.'" (P. 181.) "John is preaching the riches of the kingdom of God offered to the world by the Gospel and signifying at the same time how few there are who receive it; that is, from the enmity of the 'free will' against it, the power of which is nothing else than this: Satan reigning over it and causing it to reject grace." (P. 199.) No, the Luther of *De Servo Arbitrio* cannot qualify as a Calvinistic theologian. He is ignorant of one of the fundamental tenets of Calvinism.

In the third place, a fundamental difference between Calvin's theology and Luther's consists in this, that the doctrine of predestination forms the heart and center of Calvinism, while Luther's theology is dominated by the Gospel of sole, universal, saving grace in Christ Crucified. "Even the Reformed theologian A. Schweitzer admits as much when he says in his *Zentraldogmen* (I, 445): 'In the Zwinglian-Calvinian type of doctrine, predestination is a dogma important as such and *regulating* the other doctrines, yea, as Martyr, Beza, and others say, the chief part of Christian doctrine, while in the Lutheran type of doctrine it is merely a dogma supporting other, more important central doctrines.'" (Bente, *Trigl.*, Hist. Introd., p. 210.) Abraham Kuyper, ranking in our day with Hodge and Warfield, tells us that Calvinism makes the dogma of the twofold predestination, of the sovereign majesty of God, the material principle of theology, "the *cor ecclesiae*," "the very center of our confession." (*The Bibl. Doct. of Election*, p. 6.) Let Kuyper read *De Servo Arbitrio*, and he would soon say: That is not Calvinian doctrine! Luther preached "nothing but Christ Crucified — Christ Crucified who brings all these things along with Himself. There is no other wisdom to be taught among Christians." (P. 80. — XVIII, 723.) Yes, Luther says much about the *hidden God*, as much as Scripture says, but he always hastens on to preach Christ

Crucified. "But let the man acquaint himself with the God Incarnate, or, as Paul saith, with Jesus crucified, in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. . . . The God Incarnate, then, here speaks thus: 'I would, and thou wouldst not!' The God Incarnate, I say, was sent for this purpose, that He might desire, speak, do, suffer, and offer unto all all things that are necessary unto salvation. . . . It belongs also to this same God Incarnate to weep, to lament, and to sigh over the perdition of the wicked." (P. 181. — XVIII, 1802.) Luther, in contrast to Calvin and Kuyper, made much, made *everything*, of the Gospel. "What is more than half of the Holy Scriptures but mere promises of grace, by which mercy, life, peace, and salvation are extended from God unto men? And what else is the whole word of promise but this: 'I desire not the death of a sinner'? . . . And if there were not these divine promises standing, by which consciences, afflicted with a sense of sin and terrified at the fear of death and Judgment, might be raised up, what place would there be for pardon or for hope? What sinner would not sink in despair?" (P. 168. — XVIII, 1791.) Luther exalts, emphasizes, preaches, first and last the Gospel of Christ Crucified. Says T. R. Glover of Cambridge: "I have said it often and do say it still," said Luther, 'he that without danger will know God and will speculate on Him, let him look first into the manger; that is, let him begin below and let him first learn to know the Son of the Virgin Mary. . . . Take good heed, I say, of high-climbing cogitations, to clamber up to heaven without this ladder, namely, the Lord Christ in His humanity.' And again, in a passage that haunts me: 'Dispute not in any case,' said Luther, 'of predestination. But if thou wilt need dispute touching the same, then I truly advise thee to begin first at the wounds of Christ, as there all disputation will cease and have an end therewith.' . . . Half our troubles in theology come from our inverting the natural Christian order—working from God to Jesus instead of from Jesus to God. Lo, I repeat to myself and to you, 'Begin first with the wounds of Christ,' and I am grateful to Luther for saying it." (See *Theol. Monthly*, 9, p. 109 f.) And the rumor has gone out that this man Luther is a masked Calvinist!

In the fourth and last place,—if we had more space at our disposal, we would not stop here,—it is a fact that Luther refuses to answer the *crux theologorum Cur alii, alii non?* That fact has been established on pages 562-572 above (August number). It is a fact that Luther declared and repeated it again and again: "Why it is that some are touched by the Law and some are not touched, why some receive the offered grace and some despise it, that is another question." (P. 171.) "Why that majesty does not take away or change this fault of the will in all it becomes us not to inquire." (P. 173.) Only the light of glory will shed light on this

matter. (P. 389.) But this is also a fact, a stubborn fact, that Calvin and all of his followers had a ready answer to this question. To them the matter is quite simple: Some are saved because of God's decree of predestination, some are lost because of God's decree of predestination. God elected some to life and others to damnation. The Calvinists cannot understand why Luther should waste so many pages on enforcing silence in this matter. They glory in the idea that they have found a satisfactory solution of the problem. They pity the Lutherans for their refusal to accept the logical solution offered by Calvin. C. Hodge says: "This [synergistic] controversy was for a time authoritatively settled by the Form of Concord. In this document both the doctrine of cooperation and that of absolute predestination were rejected. As this system was illogical and contrary to the clear declarations of Scripture, it did not long maintain its ground." (*Syst. Theol.*, II, p. 325.) Hodge declares that a theology which rejects both synergism and Calvinism is illogical. A logical mind would answer the question of the *discretio personarum* either by assuming cooperation or an absolute, twofold predestination. If Hodge or Calvin had censored *De Servo Arbitrio*, they would have stricken out all those sections dealing with the *Cur alii prae aliis?* And when Luther refused to renounce his declaration that it is wicked to give an answer satisfactory to reason, they tell him: You cannot think Calvinistically. And still the ten thousand are shouting: *De Servo Arbitrio* reflects the views of Calvin!

No, it does not! Rohnert is right when he declares: "No! The man who so emphatically asserted the universality of grace and the objectivity of the means of grace [and who found the sole cause of man's perdition in his wickedness, who put Christ into the center of his teaching and refused to explain the *discretio personarum* by assuming a twofold predestination], such a man cannot have taught deterministic doctrine." Rudelbach is right: "So viel ist sonnenklar, dass, wenn auch alle Formeln, in welchen Luther die freie Gnade und die Erwählung preist als frei schwebend ueber alle Kreaturen, zusammengenommen werden, so kommt doch kein Hundert- und kein Tausendteil von dem Calvinischen *absolutum decretum* heraus; denn kein Gran der Irrlehre kann je in ein System eindringen, ohne das Ganze zu schwaengern geschweige denn eine solche Irrlehre wie die von der absoluten Praedestination." (*Reformation, Luthertum und Union*, p. 281 f.)

In spite of this, men have been charging Luther for four hundred years with teaching fatalism, determinism, predestinarianism, Calvinism, in *De Servo Arbitrio*. And they think they are justified in doing that. What proofs are being offered? They are of a twofold nature.

The first group of arguments consists of certain statements

in *De Servo Arbitrio* which, they say, unmistakably reveal Luther's deterministic, Calvinistic views or can at least have no other than a deterministic meaning. Long lists of such statements, usually referred to as "hard," "harsh" statements, have been drawn up. An edition of *De Servo Arbitrio*, edited in 1664 by Seb. Schmid, marks those passages which seem to be "hard" and might therefore be misused, and sets them in the proper light. (XVIII, 1670.) Dr. Pieper tells us that "even some of the later Lutheran dogmaticians, well-meaning men," have complained about "the rather hard statements (*duriusculas phrases*)" occurring in our book. (*Chr. Dog.*, II, p. 53.) We do not mean to imply that all of those who stamp certain statements as Calvinistic are not in accord with the spirit of Luther's theology. But our present business is to examine these suspicious statements and see what they really mean.

They fall into three groups. The statements of the first group are of such a nature that a brief study of the context and of parallel passages will at once allay the suspicion that Luther was thinking Calvinian thoughts. There is, for instance, the statement referred to by Koeberle: "Luther's harsh deterministic statements ('the condemnation of those who have not deserved it')." This statement is perhaps considered the most incriminating piece of evidence against Luther. It is produced again and again. Harnack has it: "Luther laesst sich zu der Behauptung fortreissen, dass Gott 'die verdamme, die es nicht verdient haben.' . . . Luther laesst sich hier zu gunsten einer aeussern Konsequenz zu Behauptungen treiben, die ueber die Grenzen der Schriftwahrheit hinausgehen." (*Op. cit.*, p. 188.) Frank has it. (*Theol. der Conc.* — *Form.*, I, p. 128.) Zickendraht has it. Dieckhoff has it. And many others. Now, Luther used those very words: "If you are concerned about this, that it is difficult to defend the mercy and justice of God, seeing that He damns the undeserving." (P. 385. — XVIII, 1962.) God damns those who do not deserve damnation! That sounds bad. But Luther does not believe that those who are damned do not deserve it. He had stated on p. 325: "What is this [Rom. 1:18] but declaring that they all merit wrath and punishment?" He had certainly not forgotten that when he got to page 385. We need not list any additional statements. Why, the very next words describe these "undeserving" as "ungodly." "He damns the undeserving, that is, those who are for that reason *ungodly*." Men should not quote statements of Luther in such a way as to create the impression that Luther really taught that the God of love and of justice consigned innocent, holy, God-fearing men to eternal damnation. What does Luther really say and mean when he speaks of ungodly men being undeserving of damnation?

Please read on page 389 (XVIII, 1966): "By the light of grace it is insolvable how God can damn him who by his own powers can do nothing but sin and become guilty. Both the light of nature and the light of grace here say that the fault is not in miserable man, but in the unjust God; nor can they judge otherwise of that God who crowns the wicked man freely, without any merit, and yet crowns not, but damns another, who is perhaps less, or at least not more, wicked. But the light of glory speaks otherwise." When Luther says that God damns the undeserving, he is giving expression to what *reason* thinks. Reason thinks and says that it is unjust that God should damn men who can do nothing but sin and therefore, as reason judges, do not merit damnation. And reason insists on this the more when it deals with the *discretio personarum*, and seeing that God damns another who is perhaps less, or at least not more, wicked than the other, insists that the former does not merit damnation. You might also study pages 265-269 (XVIII, 1867 ff.). There Madam Reason has the floor and declaims on the subject of God damning the undeserving. We hear her say: "It is absurd that He should condemn him who *cannot avoid the merit of damnation*. And, on account of this absurdity it must be false that 'God hath mercy on whom He will have mercy and whom He will He hardeneth,' Rom. 9:18. He must be brought to order. He must have certain laws prescribed to Him that He damn not any one but him who, *according to our judgment*, deserves to be damned." And read on page 220: "It still remains absurd [*according to the judgment of reason*] that that God who is just and good should exact of free will impossibilities and that, when free will *cannot will good* and of necessity serves sin, that sin should yet be laid to its charge; and that, moreover, when He does not give the Spirit." And all of this our passage itself states. Only read *all* of it! "It is difficult to defend the mercy and justice of God, seeing that He damns the undeserving, that is, those who are for that reason ungodly, because being born in iniquity, they cannot by any means prevent themselves from being ungodly and from remaining so and being damned but are compelled from the necessity of nature to sin and perish, as Paul saith, 'We were by nature the children of wrath, even as others,' Eph. 2:3, when at the same time they were created such by God Himself from a corrupt seed, by means of the sin of Adam." — It is a crime to quote these bare four words and broadcast them as a quotation from Luther, "God damns the undeserving," in order to prove that Luther was a determinist, a fatalist, a Calvinist. Luther does not say that God damns the undeserving. — You say he did say it, that he certainly did write down these twenty-two letters. All right, take your

pound of flesh. You will be getting more than you bargain for. You are making Luther worse than the extremest Calvinists; for the Supralapsarians do not say that God predestinated innocent beings to damnation but that God created some *for sin* and for damnation. You are making Luther utter blasphemies of the blackest kind. (Cp. *Lehre u. Wehre*, 32, p. 196 f.)

Again, people charge Luther with teaching that God is the cause of sin (see Zickendraht, above), that He creates the evil and works sin. In other words, Luther taught what amounts to dualism: Evil springs from a divine being; Luther is no better than a Manichean. Moehler tells the world: "Melanchthon in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in the edition of the year 1525, had the hardihood to assert that God wrought all things, evil as well as good; that He was the author of David's adultery. . . . However, in this matter Melanchthon merely spoke after Luther, as the writing of the latter against Erasmus will show. . . . The Council of Trent anathematized the proposition that God works evil as well as good." (*Symbolism*, p. 38.) Now, what did Luther really say? He *did* teach: "God *made* Pharaoh wicked." But read on! "God *made* Pharaoh wicked, that is, from a wicked and corrupt seed, as He saith in the Proverbs of Solomon, 16:4: 'The Lord hath made all things for Himself; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil,' that is, *not by creating evil in them*, but by forming them out of a corrupt seed and ruling over them. . . . For although God did not make sin, yet He ceases not to form and multiply that nature which, from the Spirit being withdrawn, is defiled by sin. . . . Since, therefore, God moves and does all in all, He necessarily moves and does all in Satan and the wicked man. But He so does all in them as they themselves are and as He finds them; that is, as they are themselves averse and evil, being carried along by that motion of the divine omnipotence, they cannot but do what is averse and evil. Just as it is with a man driving a horse lame on one foot or lame on two feet; he drives him just so as the horse himself is; that is, the horse moves badly. But what can the man do? . . . God cannot do evil, although He thus works the evils by evil men; because, being good Himself, He cannot do evil; but He uses evil instruments, which cannot escape the sway and motion of His omnipotence." (P. 221 ff.—XVIII, 1833 ff.) This is repeated on page 303. And on page 318 Luther declares: "God does not work in us *without us*." But Schaff-Herzog declares that Luther excludes all other causality from human action but God Himself, and Moehler and the rest insist that Luther plainly states that God is the author of sin!—Have these men never heard anything of the *concursum divinum*? Then let them study just these portions of *De Servo Arbitrio* and

Pieper's dogmatics, I, 592 ff., and Hoenecke, II, 135, 253 ff. — Others here charge Luther with something even worse. We read in Aulén: "Es ist nicht leicht, Luther hier richtig zu verstehen. Er ist oft dahin gedeutet worden, als wuerde er bis zu einem *naturalistischen Gottesbegriff* gedraengt. Die goettliche Allmacht scheint eine *unpersoenlich* wirkende, indifferente Kraft zu werden. 'Wenn Gott treibt und wirkt alles in allem, so treibt und wirkt er mit Notwendigkeit auch beim Satan und bei den Gottlosen.'" (Weimar ed., 18, p. 709. Quoted above.) "Luther will nicht sagen, dass Gott direkt das Boese wirkt, und auch nicht, dass die Schuld dieses Boesen auf Gott ruht. Es gibt etwas, dass seinen Grund nicht im goettlichen Willen hat. Es ist erklarlich, dass man im Hinblick auf diese Gedankengaenge von einem *naturalistischen* Zuge im Gottesbegriff Luthers hat sprechen koennen. Es ist in der Tat verlockend, Luther in dieser Richtung zu deuten. Und doch kann eine solche Deutung nicht gutgeheissen werden." (*Op. cit.*, p. 222.)

Another sample: Luther was a determinist, they say, who taught that whatever man does he does under compulsion; he is a mere machine, driven by God's irresistible will. See how Luthardt above quotes Luther to that effect. He adds the additional quotation: "This, therefore, is also essentially necessary and wholesome for Christians to know: that God foreknows nothing by contingency, but that He foresees, purposes, and does all things according to His immutable, eternal, and infallible will." (P. 38.) And Moehler says: "Luther asserted that man is devoid of freedom, that every [pretended] free action is only apparent, that an irresistible divine necessity rules all things, and that every human act is at bottom only the act of God." With Melancthon, Luther "comprised all things in the circle of an unavoidable necessity and predestination, declared the doctrine that God is the sole agent to be a necessary part of all Christian science," etc. (*Op. cit.*, p. 32.) Are Luthardt and the others quoting Luther correctly? Yes. Luther said what Luthardt quotes. And he said: "All things take place according to the immutable will of God." (P. 42.) No; for they put a wrong sense into the words. Luther does not say that whatever man does he does under compulsion, against his will. (We shall have to restrict ourselves to this one feature of Luther's alleged determinism.) In the first place, Luther distinctly says: "For will, whether divine or human, does what it does, be it good or evil, not by any compulsion but by mere willingness or desire, as it were, totally free." (P. 41. — XVIII, 1692.) We might close the discussion here. But let us perform an *opus supererogationis*. Luther distinctly says: "A man void of the Spirit of God does not evil against his will as by violence, or as if he were taken by the

neck and forced to it, in the same way as a thief or cutthroat is dragged to punishment against his will; but he does it spontaneously and with a desiring willingness." (P. 72. — XVIII, 1717.) Luther a fatalist, a determinist! We could multiply similar quotations, but we refuse to do so. In the second place, Luther does speak in this connection of necessity. But note first: "I could wish indeed that we were furnished with some better term for this discussion than the commonly used term *necessity*, which cannot rightly be used, either with reference to the human will or the divine. It is of a signification too harsh and ill-suited for this subject, forcing upon the mind an idea of compulsion and that which is altogether contrary to *will*, whereas the subject which we are discussing does not require such an idea; for will does what it does . . . totally free." Note, secondly, in what sense Luther uses the term necessity. "By *necessity* I do not mean *compulsion* but (as they term it) the necessity of *immutability*, not of *compulsion*; that is, a man void of the Spirit does not evil against his will. . . . And this willingness and desire of doing evil he *cannot* by his own power leave off, restrain, or change." Luther makes it impossible for men to misunderstand him. Man sins *necessarily*? Absolutely. "He is a captive, slave, and servant to the will of Satan." (P. 79.) "He is compulsively bound to the service of sin." (P. 139.) "He must continue of necessity to sin and err until he be amended by the Spirit of God." (P. 225.) "They are compelled *from the necessity of nature* to sin and perish." (P. 385. — XVIII, 1962.) Will this suffice? But how about the Christian? "Man has no free will, but is a captive, slave, and servant *either to the will of God or to the will of Satan*." (P. 79.) The Christian *must* do good? He cannot help himself? Yes, say it. It is a sweet, a glorious necessity. "But again, on the other hand, when God works in us, the *will*, being changed and sweetly breathed on by the Spirit of God, desires and acts, not from *compulsion* but *responsively*, from pure willingness, inclination, and accord, so that it cannot be turned another way by anything contrary nor be compelled or overcome even by the gates of hell." (P. 73. — XVIII, 1718.) The Christians do good by necessity — they are under the powerful sway of their gracious Lord and, as to their new nature, *cannot* resist. They cannot but respond. It requires a great amount of animosity to misunderstand Luther. — And finally, while Luther says that man sins from necessity, he does not state anywhere that this necessity is due to a secret counsel of God's pleasure. (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 17, 183.)

Taking up a second group of hard statements charged against Luther, we find that the quotations are correct and fair, but also, that the matter objected to is the plain teaching of Scripture. For

instance, Koestlin lists among "the declarations of much harsher sound" this, that "in Luther's view no other course is possible to man, left to himself, than that he remains under the dominion of evil or even that he becomes hardened in his evil ways." (Koestlin-Hay, *The Theology of Luther*, I, 486.) But *Scripture* teaches that. Let Luther quote us a few passages. We read on page 364 (and the book is full of similar passages): "They cannot please God.' Again, 'The carnal mind is death.' Again, 'The carnal mind is enmity against God.' And again, 'It is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be,' Rom. 8:5-8. . . . 'What the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh,' Rom. 8:3." Harsh indeed but true; hard on proud man.

Again, men characterize the statements concerning the immutable will of God as deterministic. See the quotations offered by Luthardt and Rohnert. Luther replies and quotes *Scripture*: "This asserted truth therefore stands and remains invincible, that all things take place according to the immutable will of God, which they call the necessity of the consequence. Nor is there here any obscurity or ambiguity. In Isaiah He saith: 'My counsel shall stand, and I will do all My pleasure,' Is. 46:10." (P. 42.) Will you say that, when God has decided a thing, — and all of his decisions are from eternity, — the thing may, after all, not come to pass? And if you believe that God rules and orders all things, as *Scripture* teaches that not even a sparrow falls to the ground without His will, Matt. 10:29, why do you object to Luther's statement (which is good *Scripture* teaching) "that nothing can take place but according to His will (which reason herself is compelled to confess)"? (P. 390. — XVIII, 1966.) The collect says: "Whose providence ordereth all things" (Seventh Sunday after Trinity). And will you say that God's plan, covering all mankind and all creation, formed in eternity, based on His prescience, wisdom, justice, and love, changes in the course of the century, in the course of the year, in the course of the day, as though God were moved by passing whims or finds that He has made a mistake or cannot carry through His plan in the face of man's opposition? O yes, the *contingentia rerum* in human life stands. Things that have happened thus might have happened otherwise. The immutability of God's will does not mean that men have no freedom of action. But God has taken full account of this, and having ordered all things in His eternal providence, His plan and His will are immutable. "According to *Scripture* both necessity and contingency must be maintained, necessity [*necessitas immutabilitatis*] from the viewpoint of divine providence, contingency from the human viewpoint." (Pieper, *Chr. Dog.*, I, 598. See also H. Schmid, *Doc. Theol.*, p. 18.) If this be determinism, Luther was misled by *Scripture*.

Another example: Luther, they say, speaks of a divine judgment of obduration, and that is Calvinism. We say: *Scripture* speaks of this judgment of obduration. Luther quotes *Scripture* when he declares that "God hardened Pharaoh." He quotes *Scripture* when he says that "God hath mercy on whom He will have mercy and whom He will He hardeneth," Rom. 9: 18! "God suffered the ungodly to be hardened and to remain in unbelief." That is Luther speaking, p. 299. It is *Scripture* speaking. "That will of Majesty, from purpose, leaves and reprobates some that they might perish." (P. 181.) That is exactly what Rom. 9: 18 declares. If that is a harsh statement, settle it with *Scripture*. Yes, it is a hard truth. Our flesh detests it. Luther knew that "it is this that seems to give the greatest offense to common sense or natural reason, that the God who is set forth as being so full of mercy and goodness should, of His mere will, leave men, harden them, and damn them." (P. 243. — XVIII, 1850.) And still Luther said it because *Scripture* says it.

Aulén is constrained to admit that Luther got his doctrine from *Scripture*. "Weiter kann auf ein biblizistisches Motiv hingewiesen werden, ein Motiv, das auf die Schriftautoritaet zurueckgeht. Luther sieht, wie die Schrift von einer Verstockung durch Gott spricht. Gott verstockt Pharaoh usw. Er fuehlt sich gebunden an solche Aussagen." (*Op. cit.*, p. 221.) Aulén does not think much of a theologian who unhesitatingly accepts any statement of *Scripture* as it stands. That would be *Biblicism*! But we who are "*Biblicists*" gladly take note of his characterization of Luther's theology.

But he is wrong when he adds: "Der Gedanke der doppelten Praedestination wird [von Luther] streng verfochten." The *Scripture* teaching, Luther's teaching, on this matter is something altogether different from the teaching of Calvin. Rudelbach: "Mit dem Ausdruck, dass Gott durch seine Erwaehlung geschieden habe diejenigen, so selig und verdammt werden ["determined by certain election who should be saved and who should be damned," p. 217. — XVIII, 1829], scheint Luther zwar sich dem falschen Begriff einer absoluten Praedestination zu naehern; allein, es ist nur *Schein*; denn den Grund der Verstockung und endlichen Verwerfung der Boesen findet er nicht in Gott, sondern im boesen Willen der Menschen und des Teufels. Und hier tritt eben die *Praeszienz* als das klare, sondernde Prinzip ein, das den Ratschluss Gottes zurueckfuehrt einerseits auf die unverdiente Guete und Barmherzigkeit, andererseits auf die waltende und strafende Gerechtigkeit. Mit der groessten Entschiedenheit scheidet Luther sich so von der Annahme eines *absolutum decretum*, indem er an den hervorragenden Beispielen der Verstockung im Alten und Neuen Testamente, Pharaoh und Judas, zeigt, dass beide sowie alle Gottlosen boeser

Art gewesen, das heisst, dass ihr Wille durch Verführung des Teufels und Hingabe an die Gewalt des Bösen eine von Gott abgewendete Richtung genommen habe." (*Op. cit.*, p. 282.) Stoeckhardt: "Die Verstockung *a parte Dei* erscheint demnach als die göttliche Reaktion gegen das menschliche Verhalten, als die adaequate Strafe der Selbstverstockung. Es ist schriftwidrig und im Grunde eine Blasphemie, wenn man die Verstockung aus einem *decretum absolutum reprobationis* herleitet. Auch an denen, welche schliesslich sich selbst verstocken und zur Strafe dafür von Gott verstockt werden, hat Gott zuvor nichts unversucht und ungetan gelassen, um sie zur Umkehr willig zu machen. . . . Ist es wirklich an dem, dass Paulus im 9. Kapitel die Verstockung, Verwerfung, Verdammnis der Juden in einem absoluten göttlichen Verwerfungsdekret begründet sein lässt, so widerspricht das dem, was er im 10. Kapitel von der Verwerfung Israels, von dem Unglauben der Juden lehrt." (*Roemerbrief*, pp. 438, 504.) "Was wir gemeinlich den Reprobationsbeschluss nennen, ist *nicht* die Kehrseite des Praedestinationsbeschlusses, der Gnadenwahl. Die zwei Seiten sind eben nicht parallel. Gott hat beschlossen, diejenigen, deren Unglauben er voraussah, um ihres Unglaubens willen zu verdammen. Das ist freilich eine *voluntas consequens*." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 26, p. 308.)

One more point. Those who charge Luther with Calvinian aberrations object most strongly to his teaching on the hidden will of God (*Deus absconditus*), on the unsearchable judgments of God, "who crowns the wicked man freely without any merit and yet crowns not, but damns, another who is perhaps less, or at least not more, wicked" (p. 389), and on page 173: "Why that Majesty does not take away or change this fault of the will in all . . . it becomes us not to inquire." (*Cur alii, alii non?* — See the preceding article.) These are "the declarations of much harsher sound," declares Koestlin, this, for instance: "Why, then, does God not improve also those whom He leaves under Satan's power?" (*Op. cit.*, p. 487.) And Theod. Harnack places Luther's statements concerning the secret and the revealed will among "the hardest sayings" in *De Servo Arbitrio*. "Here Luther went too far. He indulged in untheological speculations." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 190, 193.) But it is Scripture, says Luther, that makes these statements. "It is no invention of mine but a command supported by the Holy Scriptures. Paul (Rom. 9:19) speaks thus: 'Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?'" (P. 182.) "It is here the hand is to be laid upon the mouth; it is here we are to reverence what lies hidden, to adore the secret counsels of the divine Majesty, Rom. 9:20." (P. 67. See also pp. 173 and 247.) "If His righteousness were such that it was considered to be righteousness according to human judgment, it

would be no longer divine. . . . As He is the one and true God and, moreover, incomprehensible and inaccessible to human reason, it is right, nay, it is necessary, that His righteousness should be incomprehensible, even as Paul exclaims, saying: 'How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out!' Rom. 11:33." (P. 386.) "In whatever God hides Himself and will be unknown by us, that is nothing to us; and here that sentiment stands — 'What is above us does not concern us.' . . . Human temerity is to be called off and driven back that it employ not itself in prying into those secrets of Majesty which it is impossible to attain unto, seeing that they dwell in that light which is inaccessible, as Paul witnesseth 1 Tim. 6:16." (Pp. 171, 181. — XVIII, 1794, 1801.) "Christ (Matt. 11:25, 26) gives no other reason why the Gospel is hidden from the wise and revealed unto babes than this: So it pleased the Father!" (P. 194.) Do not stop with Luther and Brenz when you are listing "rather hard statements." (See Pieper, *op. cit.*, II, 53.) You will have to deal also with Scripture!

Harsh statements? Yes, and Luther knew it. "The Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, discourses on these same things, not 'in a corner,' but in public and before the whole world, and that with a free open mouth, nay, in the harshest terms, saying, 'Whom He will He hardeneth,' Rom. 9:18; and again, 'God, willing to show His wrath,' etc., Rom. 9:22. What is more severe, that is, to the flesh, than that word of Christ: 'Many are called but few chosen,' Matt. 22:14?" (P. 65. — XVIII, 1712.)

"He hath mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth," Rom. 9:18. It is not Calvinism to teach that. It is not Calvinism when Stoeckhardt writes: "Wir koennen nicht begreifen, warum von zweien, die beide von Natur gleich suendig und verkehrt sind, Gott des einen sich erbarmt und den andern verstockt, den einen in die selbstverschuldete Verstockung dahingibt, waehrend er einen andern, der sich nicht besser verhaelt, bekehrt, warum Gott bei den einen das Widerstreben bis zum Aeussersten gewahren laesst, waehrend er es bei andern wegnimmt, ehe es zur Selbstverstockung und Verstockung kommt." (*Op. cit.*, p. 442.) It is not Calvinism to say that what God does He wills to do, to say that the hidden will of God is a will. "Gewiss, Gott hat hierfuer seine weisen und gerechten Motive. . . . Gott laesst eben geschehen, was sie wollen. Indes involviert dieses Geschehenlassen keine Schwaeche in Gott und geschieht nicht ohne den Willen Gottes, ohne den nichts auf Erden geschieht und der immer weise und gerecht ist, ob wir es auch nicht verstehen." (*L. c.*) It is not Calvinism to teach that what God does He wills to do, but it is Calvinism to teach that an absolute decree of reprobation lies back of God's judgment of obduration, that God would not save

some. "Es sei an diesem Ort nochmals betont, dass Paulus von keinem geheimen, absoluten Verwerfungsdekret Gottes weiss. Was er an unserer Stelle (Roem. 9:18) von dem Willen Gottes sagt, und zwar sofern er auf die Verstockung geht, schliesst kein solches Dekret in sich und schliesst den allgemeinen Gnadenwillen Gottes nicht aus. . . . Sie haben nicht gewollt." (L. c.)⁵³⁾

Coming to the third group of hard statements, we hear Dr. Pieper saying: "Luthers *De Servo Arbitrio* dagegen ist starke Speise; Luther redet von den hohen Dingen kuehn, so kuehn, dass der Leser wohl wiederholt stehenbleibt und sich fragt: 'Wie mag Luther das meinen?' Aber wir glauben nicht, dass jemand, in dem wirklich die Lehre des lutherischen Bekenntnisses lebt, den Mut gewinnen kann, Luther falscher Lehre zu zeihen, selbst wenn er *sich nicht getraut, so zu reden, wie Luther redet.*" (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 32, p. 204.) We would not in every instance use Luther's language. Rohnert says: "The phraseology of Luther may not in all cases be perfectly correct, but his words serve a right cause." (*Op. cit.*, p. 242.) The old theologian quoted above makes this apt statement: "Augustine said that the ancient fathers, in the days before the Pelagian controversy, did not always speak guardedly ('sie haetten etwas sorglos geredet')." We say the same with respect to Luther.

53) Is it necessary to discuss in this connection the fact that Luther and Calvin in some instances use the same words and phrases? If so, we shall point out that this does not identify their teaching. *Lehre und Wehre*, 14, p. 125, quotes a writer of Germany: "When Calvin employs in his teaching on justification to some extent the words of Luther, and when, on the other hand, Luther, in his teaching on predestination (particularly in *De Servo Arbitrio*), employs to some extent the words of Calvin, attention must be called to the old saw *Duo si dicunt idem, non est idem*. The facts of this case are that Calvin subordinates his doctrine of justification to the doctrine of predestination, but Luther subordinates his doctrine of predestination to his doctrine of justification." See Pieper, *Chr. Dog.*, II, p. 51 f.: Though both, Calvin and Luther, speak of a revealed and a secret will of God, they differ absolutely on the matter itself. Luther clings to Scripture in defining the extent of God's gracious will; Calvin follows the light of reason and experience. Luther clings to the universality of grace, proclaimed in Scripture, Calvin insists on the particularity of grace, since not all are actually saved. Luther teaches the efficacy of the means of grace also in the case of those who resist; Calvin teaches that this efficacy is restricted to the elect. Luther speaks of a seeming contradiction between the revealed and the secret will of God; Calvin, of a real contradiction; and he cancels the revealed will by means of the secret will. See also *Lehre u. Wehre*, 32, p. 201: Pieper on the same point. An old Lutheran theologian, quoted in *Lehre u. Wehre*, 17, p. 183: "Though Luther employs somewhat hard words in *De Servo Arbitrio*, they are not the same as the rude language of the Zwinglians, who say that God is the cause of sin, that the thief is compelled by God to steal, that God would not have all men to be saved, that reprobation is absolute."—On the use of the term "reprobation" in Lutheran theology, as being the act of the *voluntas consequens, voluntas iustitiae*, see Formula of Concord, Thor. Decl., XI, §§ 40, 57; *Lehre u. Wehre*, 26, 308; 29, 55 (Walther).

The Calvinistic dogma of an absolute reprobation was not yet born." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 17, 182.) We do not quite know what to make of Luther's statements: "Having determined by certain election who should be saved and who should be damned." (P. 217. — XVIII, 1829.) "As one created unto eternal life or eternal death." (P. 76. — XVIII, 1720.) With regard to a similar expression occurring in Luther's Preface to Romans—"the eternal predestination of God, whence it originally flows whether a person is to believe or not," Dr. Walther, after stating that "Luther does not mean to utter the Calvinian heresy that also unbelief must be traced back to predestination," adds: "We have only stated what Luther's words, judged by his other utterances, cannot mean; but *what* they mean we have not attempted to explain, for the simple reason that the matter has not been, and still is not, perfectly clear to us." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 27, p. 48.) We may have some idea what Luther meant to express in these words. But now, since the Calvinists have made such phrases as "create unto death," "predestination unto damnation," their trade-mark, we absolutely reject them. And if that had been the situation when Luther wrote, he might not have written as he did. *Er hat etwas sorglos geredet*. His opponent was not Calvin but Erasmus. He kept his eye on the monster free will and let fall an occasional unguarded word.⁵⁴⁾

Are men justified, on the basis of these "hard statements,"⁵⁵⁾ in putting the stigma of Calvinism on Luther? If Luther had here really been thinking and expressing and inculcating determinism, while he, on the other pages, was denying and combating the essential teachings of Calvinism, he could not have been in his right senses when he wrote his classic. Are you willing to assume that? Are you willing to give his book the subtitle "Confusion worse Confounded"? Besides, Luther himself issued an injunction against those who would put a deterministic sense into it. Towards the end of his life he publicly stated: "I hear that everywhere among the nobles and magnates profane sayings are spread concerning

54) It is not fair to quote Lutheran words and pronounce them with the Calvinian accent. A. E. Deitz writes: "One way out of the dilemma is to say, as some theologians do, that it is quite impossible for us to determine why God elects some men to salvation and passes others by." (See page 566, August issue.) Now, Luther uses a phrase equivalent to "pass by." "That will of Majesty leaves and reprobates some." (P. 181.) "Nor do they solve the question, Why does God justify one and leave another?" (P. 353.) Luther might have said "pass by." But it is not fair to use such phrases, in their Calvinian connotation, in setting forth the Lutheran doctrine.

55) We have not discussed all of them in detail. But those we have discussed are fairly representative of all.—The difficulties in the sphere of philosophy which Luther is compelled to discuss in his refutation of the arguments of Erasmus do not concern us here. We'll leave that to the philosophers. We are here concerned with Luther the theologian.

predestination or divine prescience. For they say: 'If I am predestinated, I shall be saved whether I have done good or evil. If I am not predestinated, I shall be damned without any regard whatever to my works.' Against these ungodly sayings I would gladly argue at length if my ill health would permit." And then, having referred specially to his book *De Servo Arbitrio*, he declares: "After my death many will quote my books and by them try to prove and confirm all manner of errors and follies of their own. Now, among others I have written that all things are absolute and necessary; but at the same time (and very often at other times) I added that we must look upon the revealed God. . . . But they will pass by all these passages and pick out those only concerning the hidden God. You, therefore, who are now hearing me, remember that I have taught that we must not inquire concerning the predestination of the hidden God but acquiesce in that which is revealed by the call and the ministry of the Word. . . . In Him [Christ] therefore is no damnation or wrath but the good will of God the Father." Be sure to read the full statement, cols. 174-185 of the St. Louis Edition, Vol. II, on Gen. 26:9. (Portions translated in *Triglotta*, Hist. Intr., p. 223 ff.) Read, to be fair, *De Servo Arbitrio* as interpreted by its author. And it does not need Luther's interpretation. Let it speak for itself; get the spirit of this panegyric of God's alone-saving, universal grace, and you will declare that it is impossible that the man who stressed the universality of grace and the objectivity of the means of grace as no other man did could have been harboring deterministic thoughts. So says Rohnert, even though he finds that certain statements of Luther sound deterministic. And Rudelbach is not speaking hyperbolically and extravagantly when he declares that, when you add up all those statements which so uncompromisingly stress the sovereignty of grace, you will not get the hundredth nor the thousandth part of the Calvinian *decretum absolutum*; for if but one grain of the predestinarian heresy had been injected, it would have infected the whole. Universal grace and particular grace do not mix. (See further *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1938, p. 74 ff. *Theol. Quarterly*, 10, p. 222 f. A. Hamel, *Der junge Luther u. Augustinus*, II, p. 111 ff. Dau, *Luther Examined and Reexamined*, chap. 16: "The Fatalist Luther." Pieper, *Chr. Dog.*, II, p. 46 ff.)

There is a second reason why men feel impelled to brand *De Servo Arbitrio* as a predestinarian writing, a reason which has more weight with a certain type of theologians than all of these "hard" sayings. What Luther really taught in his book is of such a nature that these men would denounce him as a Calvinist even if he had not uttered these "hard" sayings.

TH. ENGELDER

(To be concluded)

Was lehrt die Schrift über die iustitia civilis?

3. Die praktische Anwendung der Lehre von der iustitia civilis

Wir beschränken uns darauf, einige Fragen, die uns für unsere Zeit besondere Bedeutung zu haben scheinen, herauszugreifen und kurz zu beantworten.

1. Wem gelten die Forderungen der *iustitia civilis*? Während das Gesetz, wie unser Kathismus sagt, als Regel nur den Wiedergeborenen dient, weil eben nur sie allein gute Werke tun können, die Gott gefällig sind, richten sich die Forderungen der *iustitia civilis* an alle Menschen ohne Ausnahme und Unterschied. Es macht dabei keinen Unterschied, ob der betreffende Staat eine Monarchie oder eine Demokratie ist oder ob er einen Diktator an der Spitze hat. Alle sollen sich den Forderungen der staatlichen Gesetzgebung unterordnen. Dies schließt also auch die Christen in sich. Rom beansprucht für sich eine Ausnahme der weltlichen Gesetzgebung gegenüber. Zu solcher Ausnahmestellung ist weder Rom noch sonst irgendeine Kirchengemeinschaft berechtigt. Wenn zum Beispiel grobe Unsitlichkeit in Mönchs- und Nonnenklöstern an den Tag kommt, so hat der Staat ein gutes Recht, da einzugreifen und die Schuldigen zu bestrafen. Rom darf nicht sagen, daß es selber die Betroffenen in Kirchengewalt nehmen wolle und daß darum der Staat sich um diese Angelegenheit nicht weiter zu kümmern brauche. Selbst unser Herr und Heiland Jesus Christus gab dem Pilatus gegenüber zu, daß dieser Gewalt über ihn habe, indem er sagte: „Du hättest keine Gewalt über mich, wenn sie dir nicht wäre von oben herab gegeben“, Joh. 19, 11. Sobald eine Kirchengemeinschaft irgend etwas tut oder unternimmt, was der Gesetzgebung des Staates zuwider oder gar staatsgefährlich ist, hat der Staat das Recht, einzugreifen und die Schuldigen zu bestrafen. Nur dann überschreitet der Staat sein Recht, wenn er die Kirche zu verhindern sucht, Gotte zu geben, was Gottes ist. Wenn zwei Eisenbahnzüge aneinanderfahren, so kommt das daher, daß einer von beiden nicht auf dem richtigen Geleise fährt. Wenn Staat und Kirche miteinander kollidieren, so ist die Ursache die, daß entweder der Staat oder die Kirche nicht auf ihrem Gebiete geblieben ist, sondern sich Übergriffe hat zuschulden kommen lassen. Wenn ein Staat es für weise hält, diejenigen zu bestrafen, die sich wegen eines irdenden Gewissens weigern wollen, Kriegsdienste zu leisten, so ist er damit in seinem vollen Recht. Er dürfte es den Sektenkirchen verbieten, ihren Pazifismus öffentlich zu predigen, weil das unter Umständen sehr staatsgefährlich werden kann. Gewiß haben die Christen noch ein höheres Gebot, das Gebot der Liebe (der Staat kennt als solcher nur die natürliche Liebe); aber das gibt den Christen kein Recht, eine Ausnahmestellung den Forderungen der *iustitia civilis* gegenüber einzunehmen. Auch ein Christ soll sich dem fügen, was die allgemeine Sitte verlangt. Auch Paulus unterwarf sich dem weltlichen Gericht, Act. 25,

7-11. Der Staat hat Recht und Macht, darüber zu wachen, ob die einzelnen Kirchengemeinschaften des Landes sich etwas wider die öffentliche Moral und den allgemeinen Anstand zuschulden kommen lassen. (Vielweiberei der Mormonen.)

2. Hat der Staat eine Erziehungsaufgabe? Da es zur Aufrechterhaltung guter Sitten und Ordnungen unbedingt nötig ist, daß Zucht und Ehrbarkeit wenigstens einigermaßen im Lande herrschen, so hat der Staat auch Recht und Pflicht, dafür zu sorgen, daß die Kinder des Landes zu guten Staatsbürgern erzogen werden. Zu diesem Zweck errichtet und erhält der Staat die öffentlichen Schulen. Da ist es unbedingt nötig, den Schülern einzuprägen, was Anstand und Ehrbarkeit erfordern, daß sie nicht lügen und stehlen sollen, daß sie sich höflich und manierlich zu betragen haben. Auch Patriotismus ist in den Schulen zu pflegen. Das alles muß sich aufbauen auf der natürlichen Liebe und dem natürlichen Ehrgefühl. Eine lutherische Lehrerin, die in einer öffentlichen Staatschule unterrichtet, sollte nicht die Kinder ermahnen zu einem ordentlichen Lebenswandel auf Grund der Liebe, die aus dem Glauben an Jesum Christum hervorgeht, sondern wenn sie die Kinder ermahnt, nicht zu lügen, nicht zu stehlen, so appelliert sie dabei an das Ehrgefühl, an die natürliche Liebe, das natürliche Mitleid, das natürliche Schamgefühl usw. Dieselbe Lehrerin unterrichtet vielleicht dieselben Kinder oder manche von ihnen in der Sonntagschule. Und nun sagt sie diesen Kindern, daß sie aus Liebe zu Gott, der uns seinen Sohn geschenkt hat, nicht lügen und stehlen sollen. So geht alles ohne Kollision ab und gibt man dem Kaiser, was des Kaisers ist, und Gotte, was Gottes ist. Dabei ist dem Staat die Arbeit der Kirche willkommen. Er definiert sie als ein Moralinstitut. Das ist von seinem Standpunkt aus ganz korrekt. Act. 2, 47 heißt es von den ersten Christen, daß sie Gnade hatten bei allem Volk. Auch die Ungläubigen erkennen vielfach an, daß die Kirche auf dem Gebiet der öffentlichen Moral etwas leistet.

3. Ist es recht, von einem sogenannten christlichen Staat zu reden? Wir wollen den Ausdruck „christliches Land“ nicht absolut verwerfen. Wenn wir die europäischen Länder und Amerika mit rein heidnischen Ländern vergleichen, so muß man allerdings sagen, daß es Länder gibt, die schon äußerlich zeigen, daß das Reich Christi in ihnen eine große Macht bildet. Wo das Christentum sich weiter ausbreitet, da bleibt es gar nicht aus, daß es dem ganzen Lande mehr oder weniger sein Gepräge aufdrückt, mögen in dem betreffenden Lande auch noch so viele Gottlose wohnen, ja mögen diese bei weitem in der Mehrzahl sein. Wir nennen solche Länder christliche Länder, weil in ihnen der Sonntag und christliche Feste allgemein bekannt sind und weil, um noch eins anzuführen, die christliche Zeitrechnung in solchen Ländern eingeführt worden ist. Jeder Jude, und wenn er noch so sehr Jesum Christum haßt, muß eine jede geschäftliche Transaktion unterzeichnen mit dem Jahr nach der Geburt des Herrn; sonst kann er keine Geschäfte

machen. In rein heidnischen Ländern weiß man nichts vom Sonntag und von christlichen Festtagen. In Travancore, wo unsere Mission arbeitet, hat man augenblicklich das Jahr 1107. Wenn man also unser Land mit einem rein heidnischen Lande vergleicht, so kann man es wohl als ein christliches bezeichnen, weil und insofern die in dem Lande wohnenden Christen diesem ein ganz spezifisches Gepräge aufgedrückt haben.

Aber wir lehnen den Ausdruck „christlicher Staat“ ab. Wenn wir recht unterrichtet sind, baut sich unser amerikanisches Recht auf dem englischen Recht auf, das hinwiederum das alte römische Recht, also ein heidnisches Recht, zur Grundlage hat. Dieses heidnische Recht Roms war gut, Act. 23, 29. Die weltliche Regierung auch sogenannter christlicher Länder kann sich gar nicht nach spezifisch christlichen Grundsätzen richten. Nehmen wir an, ein christlicher Richter habe über einen Mörder ein Urteil zu fällen. Dann wird er ihn, falls er ihn für schuldig befindet, verurteilen, ganz einerlei, ob der Mörder bußfertig ist oder nicht. Aber der selbe Richter wird vielleicht noch denselben Abend in einer Gemeindeversammlung diesen Verbrecher, weil er eben bußfertig ist, von Sünden schuld freisprechen. Und umgekehrt kann er einen andern als Richter im Gerichtshof freisprechen, weil er eben nichts wider das bürgerliche Gesetz begangen hat, aber als Gemeindeglied stimmt derselbe Richter für den Ausschluß desselben, da er etwa als Pharisäer offenkundig geworden ist.

4. Kann man darum, weil der Staat keine Religion lehren soll, ihn mit einem seelenlosen Körper vergleichen? Manche haben die Meinung, daß der Staat sich nur nach dem starren Gesetz zu richten habe ohne irgendwelche andere Erwägung. So sei z. B. bei Gerichtsfällen nur zu untersuchen, ob der Angeklagte schuldig oder unschuldig ist, und dann sei eben die vom Gesetz festgesetzte Strafe zu bestimmen, und das sei alles. Überhaupt sei nur darauf zu sehen, daß alles genau nach dem Gesetz ausgeführt werde. Nun soll gewiß der Staat Rache üben, die Schuldigen bestrafen und auf Aufrechterhaltung der Gesetze bedacht sein. Aber er soll dabei nie aus den Augen verlieren, daß das Gesetz nicht um seiner selbst willen da ist. Es ist um der Menschen willen da. Wenn ein Paar eine Scheidung beantragt, so soll der Richter sich bemühen, eine Ausöhnung herbeizuführen; jugendliche Missetäter soll er ermahnen. Wenn Zuchthäusler ihre Freiheit wiedererlangen, sollen die Beamten tun, was sie können, aus den Betroffenen wieder nützliche Glieder der menschlichen Gesellschaft zu machen. Außerdem soll der Staat sich der Armen und Bedrängten nach Möglichkeit annehmen, Kunst und Wissenschaften fördern, auf Wohlfahrtsseinrichtungen, den Bau von Kliniken und Hospitälern und überhaupt auf das körperliche und geistige Wohl der Bewohner des Landes bedacht sein. Diejenigen, die den Staat einen seelenlosen Körper nennen, wollen mit diesem Ausdruck sagen, daß der Staat sich von der

Kirche beraten und helfen lassen müsse, um die allgemeine Moralität im Lande zu heben und zu fördern. Der nächste Schritt ist dann die Staatskirche. Gewiß sollte ein jeder Staat die Arbeit der christlichen Kirche willkommen heißen. Das ist sogar in rein heidnischen Ländern der Fall. Aber der Staat kann seinen verschiedenen Aufgaben selber nachkommen, ohne sich dabei von der Kirche beraten zu lassen oder einen Teil dieser seiner Aufgabe dabei der Kirche zu übertragen. Es ist nicht recht, wenn Kirchengemeinschaften die Leitung öffentlicher Schulen, die doch auf Staatskosten erhalten werden, beanspruchen, weil eben der Staat ein seelenloser Körper sei. Der Staat kann in seinen Schulen keine christliche Erziehung darbieten, aber er kann und soll allgemeine Moral lehren.

5. Hat der Staat Recht und Macht, christliche Grundsätze aufzustellen und christliche Sitten einzuführen? Die Obrigkeit steht auf dem Grunde der natürlichen Gottesoffenbarung. Sie soll sich nicht in die inneren Angelegenheiten der Kirche einmischen. Aber sie ignoriert nicht das Dasein Gottes. Ein Silberdollar trägt die Inschrift "In God we trust". Das ist nicht etwas spezifisch Christliches, denn das eigentliche Wesen der christlichen Religion ist die Lehre von der Vergebung der Sünden durch Christum. So läßt die Obrigkeit einen jeden schwören bei seinem Gott. Eine vernünftige Obrigkeit erlaubt nicht nur Kirchen, sondern wünscht sie, ohne dabei eine Kirche vor der andern zu bevorzugen. Auch stellt die Obrigkeit nicht christliche Grundsätze auf. Im Staat gelten oftmals andere Grundsätze als in der Kirche. In der Kirche gilt Gal. 3, 28, 29, nicht so im Staat. In der Kirche dürfen wir keinem die Bruderhand verweigern wegen seiner Hautfarbe. Aber ein Land hat das Recht, gewisse Rassen von der Einwanderung auszuschließen. Eine Gemeinde soll keinen zurückweisen, weil er ihr vielleicht einmal zur Last fallen könnte. Der Staat dagegen kann solchen Leuten die Einwanderung verbieten. Daß man die Todesstrafe abschaffen will und sich dabei auf die Lehren des Christentums beruft, ist Unverstand. Gewiß darf der Staat den Sonntag und christliche Festtage zu öffentlichen Ruhetagen machen, aber dann sind diese eben in den Augen des Staates öffentliche Ruhetage und nichts weiter.

6. Aber hat die Kirche nicht den obrigkeitlichen Personen gegenüber eine Missionspflicht, und soll sie nicht schon aus diesem Grunde der Obrigkeit Gottes Wort vorhalten? Wir antworten, daß wir nie und unter keinen Umständen der Obrigkeit als solcher Gottes Wort zu predigen haben. Wir haben zur Genüge gezeigt, daß das Land nicht mit Gottes Wort zu regieren ist. Aber wohl können unter Umständen obrigkeitliche Personen, auch der Landespräsident, für uns Missionsmaterial sein. Dann predigen wir ihnen Buße, wie Johannes der Täufer dem Könige Herodes seine Sünden vorgehalten hat. Aber wir belehren sie nicht aus Gottes Wort, wie sie das Land

zu regieren haben. Wann haben je der Herr Christus und die Apostel den Staatsbeamten ungebeten einen Rat erteilt, wie sie das Land regieren sollten? Luther (III, 993 ff.): „Aber des weltlichen Regiments macht sich der Herr Christus nicht an, denn da hat er sonst Leute zu gegeben, die es innehaben und verwalten nach Maß und Recht der Billigkeit.“

7. Darf sich die Kirche in die Politik des Landes einmischen? Man schließt da ungefähr folgendermaßen. Zunächst wird gesagt, daß es doch Pflicht eines jeden Christen sei, der Stadt Bestes zu suchen, und daß doch ein Christ sich in all seinem Tun und Lassen stets nach Gottes Wort zu richten habe, daß er, auch wenn er sich politisch betätige, nichts tun dürfe, was wider die christliche Liebe sei, und daß doch ein Pastor auch hierüber die ihm anvertrauten Seelen beraten müsse. Und dann fängt man an, an einigen Beispielen zu zeigen, was da, wie man meint, in den verschiedenen politischen Tagesfragen, die gerade augenblicklich die Gemüter bewegen, nach Gottes Wort die rechte Lösung sei, und ehe man es sich versieht, ist man mitten in der Politik drin und politisiert nach Kräften über die Prohibitionsfrage, über die Arbeiterunruhen und über allerlei Vorlagen der Regierung. Der Fehler liegt darin, daß man nicht zu unterscheiden weiß zwischen den zwei verschiedenen Gebieten, mit denen es Kirche und Staat zu tun haben. Das Fundament der Kirche ist das Evangelium, das des Staates die natürliche Moral. Der vorhin schon angeführte Gogarten schreibt in seiner Abhandlung „Die Selbstverständlichkeiten unserer Zeit und der christliche Glaube“, S. 63: „Wer will, daß die Welt nach den sogenannten Maßstäben des Evangeliums umgestaltet werde, weiß einfach nicht, was Evangelium ist, und er verrät das Evangelium. Bestrebungen, die darauf ausgehen, sind der eigentliche und schlimmste Säkularismus.“ Für einen Christen ist es etwas ganz Selbstverständliches, daß er stets aufs ängstlichste darauf bedacht ist, für seine Person allen Forderungen der christlichen Moral, wozu ihn ja schon seine Taufe verpflichtet, nachzukommen, auch bei seiner etwaigen politischen Tätigkeit, daß er nicht lüge und sich keine Unehrlichkeit zuschulden kommen lasse. Aber er handelt nicht unrecht, wenn er für die Schaffung eines Gesetzes arbeitet, das manches gestattet, was Gottes Gesetz verbietet, wie z. B. eines Gesetzes, das einem Bewohner des Landes eine Scheidung gestattet, die nach Gottes Wort nicht zulässig ist. Er für seine Person dürfte von diesem Gesetz nie Gebrauch machen. Aber für Ungläubige ein solches Staatsgesetz zu machen, ist nicht unrecht. Wie kann nun aber die Kirche darüber etwas aussagen, wie ein solches Gesetz sollte beschaffen sein? Darüber findet sie ja nichts in Gottes Wort. Das Gebot der christlichen Nächstenliebe gibt hierüber keine Auskunft. Dazu gehört weltliche Weisheit. Wir führen hier wieder ein Wort von Luther an (V, 857): „Zwar, so hat Gott das weltliche Regiment der Vernunft unterworfen und befohlen, weil es nicht der Seelen Heil noch ewiges Gut, sondern

allein leibliche und zeitliche Güter regieren soll, welche dem Menschen Gott unterwirft, 1 Mos. 2, 8 ff.; derhalben auch im Evangelio nichts davon gelehrt wird, wie es zu halten und zu regieren sei, ohne daß es gebeut, man solle es ehren und nicht dawider sich setzen. Darum können hievon die Heiden (wie sie denn auch getan) wohl sagen und lehren; und die Wahrheit zu sagen, sind sie in solchen Sachen weit über die Christen geschickt, wie auch Christus selbst sagt, daß die Kinder dieser Welt klüger sind weder die Kinder des Lichts.“ S. 859: „Denn weil Gott den Heiden oder der Vernunft hat wollen die zeitliche Herrschaft geben, hat er ja auch müssen Leute dazu geben, die es mit Weisheit und Mut regieren könnten, dazu geneigt und geschickt wären und erhielten.“ Darum sollten der Regel nach Personen, die in einem öffentlichen kirchlichen Amte als Lehrer der Kirche angestellt sind, sich nicht öffentlich aktiv an der Politik des Landes beteiligen. Die Politik gehört nun einmal nicht zu der Aufgabe der Kirche. Wenn solche, die als Lehrer der Kirche in einem öffentlichen kirchlichen Amte stehen, etwa als Pastoren an Gemeinden oder als Redakteure an christlichen Zeitschriften oder als Professoren an unsern Anstalten, sich öffentlich in der Politik hören lassen, so kann das schädlich wirken und böse, schwere Folgen nach sich ziehen. Manche Christen werden nicht auseinanderzuhalten vermögen, was der Betreffende als Votum Gottes sagt und was das Produkt seines menschlichen Verstandes ist. Er selber wird wahrscheinlich beides nicht klar auseinanderhalten können. Für einen Lehrer der Kirche gilt das Wort: „So jemand redet, daß er's rede als Gottes Wort“, 1 Petr. 4, 11. Ein Politiker dagegen begründet, was er sagt, mit der Vernunft. Wie gefährlich kann es erst recht für den Frieden der Kirche werden, wenn diejenigen, die öffentliche Lehrer der Kirche sind, auch in politischen Fragen eine Gefolgschaft zu erlangen sich bemühen. Damit ist nicht viel genügt, daß sie etwa hinzusetzen, daß sie jetzt nicht als berufene Lehrer der Kirche reden, sondern eben als Politiker. Und wie viele gibt es, die selbst auf der Kanzel ihre politischen Meinungen vortragen! Beachtenswert ist ein Zitat von Jefferson, angeführt in Walter A. Maier's *The Jeffersonian Ideals of Religious Liberty*, S. 15: „Collections of men associate under the name of congregations and employ a religious teacher of the particular set of opinions of which they happen to be and contribute to make up a stipend as a compensation for the trouble of delivering to them, at such periods as they agree upon, lessons in the religion they profess. If they want instruction in other sciences or art, they apply to other instructors; and this is generally the business of early life. But I suppose there is not a single instance of a single congregation which has employed their preacher for the mixed purposes of lecturing them from the pulpit in chemistry, in medicine, in law, in science, and in the principles of government. Whenever, therefore, preachers, instead of a lesson in religion, put them

off with a discourse on the Copernican system, on chemical affinities, on the construction of government, or the character or conduct of those administering it, it is a breach of contract, depriving their audience of the kind of service for which they are salaried and giving them instead what they did not want. . . . In choosing our pastor, we look to his religious qualifications, without entering into his physical or political dogmas, with which we mean to have nothing to do."

Wir sind uns dessen bewußt, dies Thema nicht erschöpfend behandelt zu haben. Das war auch nicht unsere Absicht. Der Zweck dieser Arbeit sollte nur sein, zu zeigen, daß die *iustitia civilis* ihr eigenes Gebiet hat, wohl geschieden und getrennt von der *iustitia vitae*. Es ist sehr leicht, zu sagen, Staat und Kirche müssen voneinander getrennt bleiben; aber es ist überaus schwierig, diesen Grundsatz in der Praxis überall korrekt durchzuführen. Nur der, der da weiß, was es eigentlich mit der *iustitia civilis* auf sich hat, ist wirklich imstande, die Trennungslinie zwischen Staat und Kirche recht zu ziehen. Darum ist es wohl angebracht, bei unsern Studien und auf unsern Konferenzen auch dieser Frage einmal etwas Zeit und Kraft zu widmen.

Aber wir wollen nie vergessen, daß die natürliche Liebe, die das Leben der Menschen miteinander mit zu regeln hilft, und daß die Ehre, zu deren Aufrechterhaltung Staat und Gesellschaft da sind, und daß die Stimme des Gewissens, das uns immer wieder das Dasein Gottes und die Forderungen und Drohungen des Moralgesetzes vor Augen hält, uns nichts helfen in unserm Verhältnis zu Gott. Wenn wir selig werden wollen, so müssen wir das Vertrauen auf eigene Ehre und auf irgend welche Liebeswerke fahren lassen. Christus sagt Joh. 5, 44: „Wie könnt ihr glauben, die ihr Ehre voneinander nehmt, und die Ehre, die von Gott allein ist, suchet ihr nicht?“ Wie der Herr über die Liebe der Zöllner und Sünder denkt, haben wir schon vorher erwähnt. Wir müssen sprechen: „Nichts kann ich vor Gott ja bringen Als nur dich, mein höchstes Gut.“ Staat, Familie und Gesellschaft haben vor allem die Aufgabe, einigermaßen Zucht und Sitte aufrechtzuerhalten, bis das Reich Gottes vollendet ist. Dann vergehen die Reiche dieser Welt und alle sozialen Ordnungen und Stände, dann haben sie ihren Zweck erfüllt. Für die Kirche aber beginnt dann die ihr von Christo ererbene Herrlichkeit, die kein Ende nehmen wird.

G. Hübener

The Lure of Biblical and Christian Archeology

A few years ago Prof. Ralph Van Deman Magoffin, then president of the Archeological Institute of America, wrote a fascinating little book, to which he gave the title *The Lure and Lore of Archeology*. About one third of his discussion in this book concerns itself with the first part of his subject, while the remaining two thirds of the book speak of the history and the science of archeology. The presentation is not technical, and therefore even the layman in the field will be able to follow the author without difficulty. Moreover, it is surprising to learn that the writer discusses so many subjects connected with archeology which are also of great interest to the theologian. And it is from the angle of the pastor and preacher that we wish to present the subject of Biblical and Christian archeology; for it is a field of investigation and information which will more than repay every student of the Bible if he will give it the attention which it deserves or if he will at least take note of some of the most important data in connection with his reading and indexing.

We here assume, chiefly on the basis of expressions from various sources, that the advantages of work in this department of study are generally known and acknowledged. For it is not merely the stimulation of information in itself that serves as a motive in the field of archeology but also that of practical application and use. One can hardly get an adequate picture of the daily life of people in Bible times and in particular of the social and economic conditions in the Orient two to four millenniums ago without the information supplied by archeology. It is true that this information is not required for the teaching of the doctrine pertaining to salvation as such, but it certainly enhances the presentation in a well-conducted Bible hour, and in many instances it supplies the background and the foil for the historical statements of the Bible.

Let us take an example from the book referred to in our introductory paragraph. Magoffin writes (p. 23): "In the thirteenth verse of the second chapter of Revelation, referring to Pergamum, it is written: I know thy works and where thou dwellest, even where *Satan's seat* is. That statement nonplused commentators until archeologists began to excavate at Pergamum. They laid bare the 'seat of Satan.' It was a temple of the ancient pagan gods, the altar of which had as its artistic adornment a sculptured battle between the gods and the giants. When the Germans excavated Pergamum from 1878 to 1886, they came upon this magnificent altar with its slabs of sculptured beauty. After getting out several of the slabs, the excitement became so intense that the

excavators sat down and simply wept for joy. Soon, to their mingled horror and amusement, they found they were sitting upon Zeus, the greatest of the Olympian deities. The 'seat of Satan,' the Pergamene altar, is now one of the most prized possessions of the Asia Minor museum in Berlin." And so other examples, thousands of them, could be adduced to show the value of archeological excavations for the Bible commentator and historian.

Let us look at a few of the fields which have been particularly fruitful in yielding valuable information to the student of the Bible, referring first of all to the Near East. Notable among the expeditions of the last decade are those of Woolley, who worked at Ur of the Chaldees, the original home of Abraham. Not only the various pieces of jewelry and other objects of craftsmanship and culture are of interest in connection with Woolley's reports, since they definitely point to the existence of an advanced civilization two thousand years before Christ, but in particular the fact that these excavators, at least to their own full satisfaction, have demonstrated that there was an antediluvian civilization and that the evidence of the pottery found would place the Deluge at the time given to it by the account of Moses. Readers of this article will recall that Breasted, the well-known authority on Egypt and other Oriental countries, a few years ago published an article, profusely illustrated, on Persepolis and the palaces of Xerxes and Darius, which fully corroborated the Biblical accounts of life at this Oriental court. And similar accounts have been brought to us from other areas in the former great empires of the East. We just mention, in passing, that constant progress has been made in our knowledge of the Hittites, so that this ancient people, whose very existence was discredited a few decades ago, is now known almost as well as the England of Henry VIII. In fact, Asia Minor presents a veritable mine of wealth of information connected with Bible accounts and the history of the Apostolic Church.

This is true in quite the same degree of Macedonia and Greece, as a reference to almost any number of the *American Journal of Archeology* will show. If, for example, the name of Erastus, the treasurer of the city of Corinth, is found in an ancient inscription connected with the gift of a mosaic floor to the city, we have every reason to believe that this was the same Erastus, "the chamberlain," of whom Paul speaks in his Letter to the Romans, chap. 16: 23 b. Again, when the ancient floors and a part of the walls and of the chancel of an ancient Corinthian basilica are excavated, we can form a pretty good picture of the rise and the subsequent decline and fall of the congregation in Corinth from possibly the third or fourth to about the tenth century. Similar interesting

and valuable discoveries have been made in practically all the Christian centers of the early centuries.

Quite naturally the Holy Land demands a special measure of our attention, since it was the center of Biblical history. Expeditions from various museums and universities have worked with encouraging success during recent decades, especially since the World War. Large parts of the East Jordan country have been ransacked for architectural remains, and excavations are carried on more or less systematically in more than a dozen places between the ancient towns of Dan and Beersheba. The archeological work in Jerusalem was begun in an intensive fashion about a hundred years ago, although even at that Magoffin states that excavation "is just beginning in Jerusalem, and work there will be both slow and unsatisfactory due to the compactness of the modern city buildings." (Cp. Vol. V: 922-929, of this journal.) Practically every handbook and every monograph on archeological work in Palestine brings additional valuable information on some part of the city, as, for instance, on the *tsinnor*, or way of access, to the upper city which was utilized by Joab in conquering the Jebusite stronghold, or the finding of a hitherto unknown gate in the western wall of the ancient City of David. With the recording of such finds in even the semipopular and popular magazines, one is in a position to add to his index and to add to his appreciation of the several parts of the Holy City.

Near the fords of the Jordan which served the Galilean Jews on their regular journeys to Jerusalem the city of Beth-Shan is located. It was a stronghold even during the wars of the children of Israel with the Philistines, as we learn from the Book of the Judges and from First Samuel. The city was so strategic a point that it served as a fortress for successive inhabitants for over 3,000 years, as excavations during the last decade have demonstrated. From the description of the journeys of Jesus it is almost certain that He passed this town in the lower valley of Jezreel on more than one occasion.

While we are in the northern part of Palestine, we may just as well pay a visit to Tell el-Kedah, which has definitely been identified by Garstang as the ancient Hazor, the stronghold of some of the mightiest nations that fought against Joshua and Israel. The pottery fragments discovered on this hill have clearly established the conquest of the city at the time given in Holy Scripture; 1 Kings 9:15 states that Solomon repaired Hazor, so that it served as a link in his chain of fortresses. Cp. the conquest of the city, 2 Kings 15:29.

On the northwest shore of the Sea of Galilee were the cities in which our Savior spent a good deal of His time and one of

which, Capernaum, He made His headquarters for approximately three years, or at least during the period of His main Galilean journeys. The location of this city has now definitely been established as that of the modern Tell-Hum. Stones from the ancient synagog, very likely that in which Jesus delivered His discourse mentioned in Luke 4, have been found, and they bear out the fact that the centurion who bore the cost of erecting this place of worship did not shrink back from expenses. Some of the ornaments of this synagog are a good deal like those of the synagog of Durah, which has recently been described in detail.

If we follow the ancient road from the Galilean highlands through the upper part of the Valley of Esdraelon and then ascend the divide toward the Valley of Sharon, we come to the location of the ancient stronghold of Megiddo, also one of the fortresses of Solomon. Cp. 1 Kings 9:15; 2 Chron. 8:6. Here a recent expedition excavated the level of Solomon's days and found one of the great stables of the king who first introduced horses in large numbers into Palestine. Each stable had twenty-four stalls, twelve on each side of the runway. Great pillars supported the roofs of each stable, and the horses were tied to the pillars. A stone manger stood between each two pillars. Space for 200 horses has been uncovered. One is filled with a feeling approximating elation when one sees pictures of these stables and notes even the hollows worn by the pawing of the horses' hoofs. The entire Biblical account of the reign of Solomon as given in Kings and Chronicles becomes more vivid as these discoveries are brought to our attention.

That one may almost speak of a romance of archeology is evident from a book like that by Kyle, *Excavating Kirjath-Sepher's Ten Cities*. It embodies the results of a joint expedition conducted by the Xenia Theological Seminary and the American School at Jerusalem and describes the work that was done at Tell Beit Mirsim, a mound thirteen miles southwest of Hebron. It speaks about the streets and houses of Kirjath-Sepher, of its water supply, of its furniture, implements, and weapons, of its cult objects and inscriptions, of its pottery, and of many other objects of interest. We get a glimpse of the city which Othniel destroyed and of that which he then built on the ruins of the old site; we are given intimate glances into the customs of the early inhabitants of the city, and the summary of results offers conclusions which bring the reader face to face with the truth of even the most incidental parts of the Scripture accounts. The author was able to estimate, with reasonable certainty, the time of Abram's call, the date of the Exodus, and the conquest of Palestine under

Joshua, the campaign of Shishak, and the destruction of the city by Nebuchadnezzar.

A similar story comes from a mound called Ain Shems, the Biblical Beth-shemesh. The excavations on this site have definitely shown that it was occupied from the seventeenth to the thirteenth century B. C. by Canaanites, that the Israelites destroyed it and built a new city on the ruins, occupying the hill till the tenth century, when it was taken by the Chaldean armies.

Another site which has received the attention of the archeologists is Tell en-Nasbeh, the ancient Mizpah. Concerning this city Magoffin writes: "During the World War a German aviator had chanced to take a photograph of the hill. Dean Badé, director of the Palestine Institute, saw the picture and was so struck by it that he secured the negative and had a clearer print made. Contours of walls and gates were then visible, contours which one does not see at all as he walks over the top of the tell. The area on top of the tell, which is enclosed by a sixteen-foot thick wall, is about eight acres. Almost at once the excavators came upon the platform of a tower citadel. Later, near the citadel, were found seven circular silos, or granaries. At the bottom of one was a stone which sealed an opening in the floor. The room below was a plastered cistern of the shape of a huge jug, and in it were found many pieces of Israelitish pottery of the Exilic period, but not a single sherd of an earlier period. The date at which this cistern was sealed was about 585 B. C. This at once made the excavators turn to the 40th and 41st chapters of Jeremiah, where is told the story of the treacherous murder of the governor of Judea, Gedaliah, whose administration under the Babylonians had been centered at Mizpah, by Ishmael and his friends, who had killed the governor and his friends and hidden their bodies in a near-by cistern. Nine cisterns were found by Badé, one of them large enough to have contained fifty or more men. . . . And so Tell en-Nasbeh has given up its secrets and revealed itself as the Mizpah of the Bible." (P. 52f.) When Badé, who has since, like Kyle, died, lectured in St. Louis, his vivid descriptions gave a real thrill to his listeners.

We cannot close this part of our discussion without referring to the work done on the site of the ancient city of Jericho, chiefly by Garstang and his assistants, who excavated here after he had completed his work at Hazor. When the scientists began to dig into the heap of ruins that had once been Jericho, they soon found ample evidence of destruction by fire, and that about 1400 B. C. Added to this came the discovery of fifteen hundred unbroken pottery vessels, of bronze weapons and trinkets, such as bead necklaces of carnelian, shell, and bone, and a number of bone

flutes, also scarabs inscribed with the royal *cartouche* of the reigning Pharaoh. But the most important discoveries were those connected with the walls of the ancient city, for the evidence definitely showed that the walls of Jericho had fallen outwards quite flat in various places, particularly on the west side of the city. In reporting on this discovery, Marston adds the explanation: "The unsatisfactory character of the foundations on which the walls stood and the defective nature of the brickwork as revealed in portions of the walls still standing no doubt contributed to the catastrophe, while the fact that the walls were tied together by the houses built astride them linked them in a simultaneous downfall." (*New Bible Evidence*, 142.) On the basis of archeological evidence therefore the Scriptural account of the fall of Jericho's walls has been shown to be true. At the same time the excavators produced evidence for the truth of the account of the marching around the city; for the entire area of Jericho was only seven acres, and the whole circumference of the city was about six hundred and fifty yards, or about the same size as the Jebusite Jerusalem which David captured.

Much more material could here be offered to stimulate the appetite of Bible students for the study of Biblical archeology, such as the evidence from Sinai, from Ras Shamra, from Tel el Amarna, and from Egypt, not to speak of a great deal of material from various parts of Europe; but we desire to refer briefly to some of the possibilities in the field of Christian archeology.

The extent of this field of knowledge can be estimated if one pages through the monumental work by the noted liturgist and archeologist Cabrol in his *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne*. But even smaller handbooks, such as those by Bennett, *Christian Archeology*, which is by no means obsolete, though now about forty years old, and Kaufmann, *Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie*, will serve to introduce the Bible student into this valuable field. For here we find information on the Christian art monuments, on the symbolism of Christian art, on early Christian paintings and mosaics, on sculpture and carvings in ivory, on early Christian church-buildings and epigraphy, on Christian poetry, hymnology, and music, on questions of the hierarchy and church discipline, on the worship and the Sacraments in the early Church, and on the archeology of Christian life (the Christian family, the Church and slavery, civil and military life, charities, general culture, and the care for the dead). Thousands of illustrations are available, and many of these present their own arguments, as, for example, the gilded glasses and bronze busts representing Peter and Paul, which, among other things, disprove the claim that Peter enjoyed the primacy or supremacy in the Apostolic Age.

Pictures of Peter go back so far at this time that several experts believe we have an authentic portrait of the apostle, just as we seem to possess a genuine portrait of Paul.

The possibilities of systematic study in this field are practically limitless, and they reach into every department of theological information, exegesis, doctrinal theology, liturgics, art, and scores of related fields. How interesting to find a Roman Catholic writer stating, for example, that the early Church knew no difference between the vestments of the laity and the clergy: "Liturgical garments were . . . originally nothing more than the good street clothes of the cultured gentleman but in the change of style gradually ceased to serve the ordinary way of living and were then, due to the conservative character of the Church, reserved for the liturgical use." (Kaufmann, *op. cit.*, 565.) One is fascinated also by the very interesting discussions of the sacred vessels as used in the early Church. The chalice of Antioch, for example, has been the topic, not only of articles in professional magazines, but even of entire books, and the experts have not yet fully agreed as to its date, some of them insisting on placing it at the end of the first century, whereas others, like Kaufmann, would not make the date earlier than the end of the second century.

But no matter which part of the field we investigate, we are bound to find information of particular importance, not only *per se* but with many possibilities for practical applications. In fact, history must be backed up by archeology and go hand in hand with it; otherwise its data will often prove inadequate and misleading. Biblical and Christian archeology should occupy a definite place in the study program of every pastor.

P. E. KRETZMANN

Sermon Study on Heb. 10:19-25

Eisenach Epistle Selection for New Year's Day

The lesson for New Year's Day consists of one long sentence made up of three exhortatory subjunctive clauses, introduced by a participle clause. In the introductory clause, vv. 19-21, the writer sums up in two statements the contents of the preceding chapters. We have the assurance of a trustworthy entrance to the sanctuary, and we have a great High Priest. On these two facts he bases a threefold admonition, to continue steadfast in faith (22) and in hope (23) and in love (24, 25). The pastor preaching on this text will do well to read the entire letter, for one cannot fully understand this passage without a knowledge of the preceding dissertation.

Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, v. 19. "Brethren." This word serves a double purpose. It is a *captatio benevolentiae* in the noblest sense of the term. The writer addresses his readers, young and old, strong and weak, as brethren. He is not speaking to them as a stern judge nor as a carping critic but as a brother who like them is human, like them a sinner, imperfect, yet like them has found the assurance of the forgiveness of all his sins through the blood of the great High Priest. At the same time the position of this word serves to emphasize the word *παρρησία*, boldness. This term originally means "telling all," speaking one's whole mind. Such unreserved speech implies utmost confidence in Him to whom we lay bare the inmost secrets of our hearts. Hence the word has acquired the sense of free and fearless confidence, cheerful assurance, that boldness which without hesitancy, without doubt, goes about its business, joyfully sure of success. Such confidence we are "having." The present participle expresses linear, durative action. We have in our possession, we are holding it as our own. The manner of coming into possession of this boldness has been shown in previous chapters, by the Word spoken to us by the Son, 1:1, and by the messengers of Christ, 2:1-4, which Word is quick and powerful, 4:12.

We have boldness "to enter into the holiest." Instead of the verbal construction of the Authorized Version, the writer uses the noun. *Εἰσόδος* may mean the act of entering or the way of entrance. Here only the objective entrance can be meant. The phrase *παρρησία εἰς* is in the New Testament invariably used of the foundation toward which the confidence is directed, never of confidence impelling one to do something, where the infinitive of the thing to be done is used. Cp. Philem. 8. Again, the Christian's confidence is not based on his own act of entering into heaven. That would be a very uncertain foundation. Cp. Mark 9:24. Finally, whenever the place into which one enters is specified, it is designated by *εἰς* (cp. 2 Pet. 1:11) or *πρός*, 1 Thess. 1:9; 2:1. In Acts 13:24 no place is mentioned. In our passage, the only remaining one in which this word is used, it is connected with the genitive, indicating that here the writer has in mind an entrance pertaining to, belonging to, the Holiest, the very same entrance or way called *ὁδός* in the verse immediately following and which had been called the way into the Holiest, 9:8. In other words, the writer speaks here of a way whereby one can enter the Holiest. The word *ἁγία*, the holy things, here designates, as in chap. 9:8, 12, the Most Holy Place, the *Kodesh Hakkodashim* of Ex. 26:33, 34, etc., the Hakkodesh of Lev. 16:2, 3, 16, 17, etc., the place "within the veil," Lev. 16:12, 15. There dwelt the Lord above

the cherubim, Ex. 30:6, above the Ark of the Covenant, in which were placed the tables of the Law, symbolizing the justice of the living Judge of all the earth, and which was covered with the mercy-seat, the symbol of the grace of the unchanging God of eternity. There was God's throne of grace and mercy. There was a way to this throne. Yet the throne was hidden from public view by a heavy veil, and the way through the veil was forbidden on pain of death to every Israelite and every stranger, Num. 1:51; 3:10, 38; 18:3, 5, 22. Only on one day was the High Priest permitted to enter, Lev. 16:13. That entrance to God's throne was a way that could never fill the heart of an Israelite with joyous assurance and confidence. It must instil dread fear and hopeless despair of ever being able to approach the mercy-seat of God by this way. All this has been changed "by the blood of Jesus." Compare what the writer has just told his readers, 9:1 to 10:18. By this blood, cleansing us from all sin and accepted by us in true faith, we have an approach to God. No longer is the way to the tree of life a forbidden way. No longer is the entrance to Paradise barred by cherubim and a sword of flame and fire. Every barrier is broken down; every prohibition has been abolished. The way is open; admission is free. "By the blood of Jesus." 'Ev, by means, because of this blood, we are in possession of joyous confidence in this entrance, or, as others translate it, we have a joyous confidence in the entrance by means of the blood of Jesus. The sense is not materially changed if we connect the last phrase with *entrance* or with *boldness*.

By a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh, v. 20. The apostle goes on to explain why we have joyous confidence in this gateway to heaven. It is so safe and sure a way, and it is open to all. A literal translation would read: which (entrance) He has initiated for us as a way, newly made and living, through the veil, that is, (through) His flesh. Needless to say, the "which" can refer only to *entrance*, not to *confidence*. Christ did not initiate confidence in the entrance as the way to God. He is not an example of faith in His blood. He has initiated a new way for us through His flesh. 'Ενκαινίζω means to innovate, not merely to renew, or repair, something that has formerly existed but to introduce something altogether new. The use of this word already points out that Jesus inaugurated something that had never before existed; dedicated (in this sense the word is used quite frequently in the LXX; cp. Deut. 20:5; 1 Kings 8:63, etc.), consecrated, a way altogether novel. Cp. also Heb. 9:18. This fact is brought out still more forcibly by the adjective "new." Πρόσφατος means newly slain, freshly killed. It is hardly probable, however, that the etymology

determined the choice of this word. The idea of a newly slain way is incongruous, to say the least, and the word has lost so completely its original meaning that it is used of a newly acquired friend, Ecclus. 9:10; strange gods, Deut. 32:17; something that did not exist or occur before, Eccl. 1:9. The idea of novelty already expressed in the verb is emphasized. It was a way not only unknown, undiscovered, unheard of (cp. 1 Cor. 2:9); it was a way non-existent before its innovation by Christ. Though new, it is an efficient, a "living" way. Says Delitzsch in his commentary: "The way into the Sanctuary of the Old Testament was simply a lifeless pavement trodden by the high priest, and by him alone; the way opened by Jesus Christ is one that really leads and carries all who enter it into the heavenly rest." We may add, the Old Testament way was a way of death to all that ventured to walk on it. The New Testament way to the sanctuary of heaven is one which has life in itself and imparts this life to those who walk on it, makes them living stones in the house of God, 1 Pet. 2:5. It is a way which never wearies those that travel on it, from which ever new life and ever fresh vigor flows up into the pilgrims, so that they daily experience the truth of that remarkable promise Is. 40:30, 31. This way is as living and everlasting as the Lord God Himself and will lead all who walk on it safely and surely to everlasting life, Is. 35:8-10.

This way is further described, and at the same time proved to be a new and living way, by the words "through the veil, that is to say, His flesh." The writer does not speak of the rending, or the removal, of the veil (cp. Matt. 27:51) as if "the weak, limit-bound, and mortal σάφξ (5:7) which He had assumed for our sakes hung like a curtain between Him and the divine sanctuary into which He would enter; and in order to [effect] such entrance, this curtain had to be withdrawn by death," Delitzsch, *Commentary on Hebrews* (publ. by T. & T. Clark), II, p. 172; *Expositor's Greek Testament*; and others. The writer is not speaking here of the way by which Jesus entered into the Sanctuary, but of the way He prepared "for us," that new and living way, consecrated for our benefit, that we may walk in it. Note the emphatic position of ἡμῖν in the original. The way to heaven, innovated by Christ, is for all. There is no distinction of order or rank or race or nationality. There is not a soul living on the face of the earth for whom this way has not been prepared, whom this way will not bring straight to heaven. But this way also leads like that to the Old Testament Sanctuary "through the veil." Cp. Lev. 4:16, 17, where "before the veil" and "before the Lord" are used side by side. Cp. also Ex. 26:31-34; Lev. 16:2. There was no other entrance. So the entrance to heaven, symbolized by the Most Holy

Place, leads through the flesh of Christ, symbolized by the veil in the Tabernacle. The term σάρξ occurs six times in our letter, the adjective σαρκινός once, and invariably the weakness of the flesh is stressed. So, when it refers to human flesh as compared with the endless life, 7:16 (adjective); with conscience, 9:10, 13; with spirits, 12:9. It is used of Christ, 5:7: "in the days of His flesh," His weakness, His humiliation. Heb. 2:14 we are told that the children are partakers of flesh and blood, and so He likewise took part of the same, of that flesh which was in every respect, excepting sin, like that of the children of man, weak, feeble, subject to suffering, agonies, death, the torments of hell. Cp. 2:17, 18; 4:15 to 5:2, 7-10; also Rom. 8:3. The first chapter of our letter very clearly brought out the necessity of Christ's appearing in the flesh, not only becoming a man, but taking part in the weakness of human nature in order to prepare the way to life for sinful mankind. Cp. "it became," 2:9, 10; "it behooved," it was necessary, 2:17; also 9:11-22, on the necessity of Christ's suffering and death. Not merely His incarnation was sufficient to prepare the way for us. He was not merely to be a *teacher* sent by God to teach us a way to life, neither to give an example of holy living. He had to suffer and die in the stead of man and therefore He had to assume the weakness of our flesh, though not its sinfulness, in order to consecrate for us the way to heaven. All this is summed up in the brief word "flesh." That is the only way to heaven for sinful mankind, a novel way, yet a living, efficacious way, a way on which we may base our faith in fullest confidence and joyous assurance that it will bring us to the goal.

And having an High Priest over the house of God, v. 21. "Having" is to be supplied from v. 19. We have in our possession not only the living way to heaven but, in addition to that, a "High Priest." The expression used here is peculiar, ἱερεῖα μέγαν. The usual term for high priest in our epistle is ἀρχιερεὺς. Chap. 4:14 He is called "the great High Priest," ἀρχιερεὺς μέγας, and therefore we hold that in our passage we should translate rather a "great Priest" or "great High Priest," especially since in the Old Testament the high priest is frequently simply designated as "the priest." The author does not merely say that we have a high priest, hence are equal to the Jews. We have a high priest who may be called a great Priest, far excelling the high priest of the Old Testament. This was the truth brought out chap. 4:14 to 10:18, and the greatness of this High Priest is emphasized in the next phrase, "over the house of God." Ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ is the common expression for the Tabernacle, Matt. 12:4; the Temple, Matt. 21:13. Here it designates the spiritual house of God, that house in which the saints above and the saints below but one communion make. Cp. Eph.

3:14, 15; Heb. 12:22-24. The term comprises both His Church on earth, Heb. 3:6; Eph. 2:19-22, and His Church in heaven, Rev. 21:3. The High Priest is "over" this house. 'Επί here means over, above, not in the sense of being far removed both in space and interest but in the sense of direction toward. Though Christ is exalted infinitely above all things in heaven and on earth, Eph. 1:20-23, yet His interest is directed toward His own. It embraces not only the saints made perfect; no, His sympathetic heart and never-ending patience and solicitude go out toward His brethren still on earth, Heb. 2:14-18; 4:15; 5:1, 2; His omnipotent mercy and loving-kindness defends them against all attacks of their enemies and strengthens and preserves them steadfast in His Word and faith until they have arrived at the final goal of that new and living way on which their feet have been placed by their loving High Priest.

Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water, v. 22. "Let us draw near," προσερχώμεθα. The LXX uses this word in translating the Hebrew נִדְּבָה in the Levitical legislation, where it has the special liturgical sense of drawing near to God for the purpose of worship or of obtaining grace and forgiveness. Cp. Lev. 9:5, 7, 8; 21:17, 18, 21, 23, etc. The writer is not speaking of our first approach to God in conversion, when, aliens from the house of God, Eph. 2:19, we were by the almighty grace of God turned from the way of sin and approached the throne of God, asking for, and obtaining, forgiveness and pardon. He is speaking in the first person, including himself, who is certainly not a stranger in the house of God. He is speaking to brethren, v. 19, converted sinners, who were, however, in danger of straying away from the Father's home. Hence the present imperative is durative: let us keep on approaching. He is exhorting them to make continued use of the way to God's throne of mercy inaugurated by their great High Priest. Of what benefit is this new and living way if we do not make use of it? If we have confidence in this way, why do we not show our confidence by walking on it? How can we ever hope to approach God if we do not walk on the only way, come to Him by the only entrance, through the veil, His flesh? Why leave the great High Priest, who leads you straight to the house and heart of God, and go back to the former Covenant, decayed, waxed old, vanished away, chap. 8:13, ever since the great High Priest fulfilled its shadows and opened the only way to the sanctuary on high? Let us approach Him daily, hourly. Let us confess all our sins and shortcomings, all our failings and transgressions, to Him who was in all respects tempted like as we are, yet without sin, 4:15. Let us whisper all

our heartaches and secret sorrows into the ear of our sympathetic High Priest, sitting on the throne of mercy, 4:15 to 5:2. Let us share our joys and sorrows with Him who is not ashamed to call us brethren, 2:11. Let us go to the Captain of salvation for strength in our battle against our enemies, 12:1-4, 12 ff., and in the hour of death let us commit body and soul to Him that can save to the uttermost, 7:25, and who will on that Day come unto our salvation, 9:28.

This daily approach to the throne of God is the best antidote against doubt and apostasy. When Nathanael asked: John 1:46, Philip told him: "Come and see." Yes, come and see! Approach God on the way prepared by Jesus, and you will see that it is a living way indeed; you will experience such sweet hours of communion with God, such comfort, such revival of your drooping spirit, such heavenly joys, that the thought of leaving your High Priest will become inconceivable to you. In response to His question, John 6:67, you will joyously respond: vv. 68, 69.

"With a true heart." Ἀληθινή expresses that which is all it professes to be. On the meaning of *heart* cp. the October issue, p. 764. All the faculties of our heart and soul are to be at His service, dedicated and consecrated to Him alone, without pretense, without selfishness, in genuine, true faith and love.

"In full assurance of faith." The verb πληροφορέω means to bear or bring the full measure of something. The noun expresses the state of being filled to overflowing, so that there is room for nothing else. Both verb, e. g., Rom. 14:5; Col. 4:12, and noun 1 Thess. 1:5, have acquired the connotation of full conviction, full assurance, expressing that certainty which leaves no room for doubt or fear or hesitation; which is altogether confidence, trust, a faith which knows of no other name, Acts 4:12, which relies on this name unshaken, unwavering, though the heathen rage and the whole world crashes, Ps. 46:1-7; which is supremely satisfied in the object of its assurance, Ps. 73:23-26. Cp. Rom. 8:28-39. What a contrast to the wavering, vacillating "faith" of many of the original and of the present-day readers of this epistle. In order to encourage all to such fulness of faith, he adds two participial clauses.

"*Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water.*" Both *sprinkle* and *wash* are ceremonial terms occurring frequently in the Levitical legislation. When the Israelites were to be received into the covenant, they were sprinkled with blood, whereupon their representatives were permitted to draw near to God, Ex. 24:4-11. Whenever an Israelite had become unclean, he was to wash before again being permitted to appear before God, Lev. 14:8, 9, etc. Cp. Ex. 29:4 on the wash-

ing, and v. 21 on the sprinkling, of Aaron and his sons whereby they were made priests and permitted to enter the Sanctuary. The fact that these two terms are, like the word "draw near," liturgical terms, together with the fact that washing and sprinkling were necessary items in the ritual prescribed for the priests before they were allowed to enter the Sanctuary, is proof sufficient that both participial clauses are to be connected with "draw near," and must neither be connected with v. 23 nor separated, the first connected with v. 22, the second with v. 23. In the Old Testament the body was sprinkled, symbolizing the inward sprinkling to be effected by the blood of Jesus, Heb. 9:12-15; 12:24. The New Testament sprinkling makes us not only ceremonially clean, as the Israelite was after being sprinkled a member of the visible congregation of Israel and the priest was, after being sprinkled, permitted to function in the sacerdotal office, irrespective of their inner relation to God. Christians have received a better sprinkling, a sprinkling of the heart, of their inner life, a sprinkling "from an evil conscience." Having been sprinkled through Word and Sacrament by the blood of Jesus, their conscience has been cleansed from sin; its accusing voice has been silenced. In its stead a good conscience, void of guilt, has been created, a conscience unafraid of God and His holiness, a conscience that will no longer cause them to hide before God in fear and shame, Gen. 3:8-10, a conscience that will gladly draw near to this God, in full assurance of faith, Rom. 8:1. Shall Christians, having been granted this unspeakable grace, ever think of becoming disloyal to their High Priest?

"Our bodies washed with pure water." In Num. 5:17 the "bitter water that causeth the curse," v. 18, is called holy water, מֵיִם קֹדְשִׁים, translated ἁγία καὶ ἀκατάρατος in the Septuagint. God's Word and command sanctified this water and endowed it with its strange power. So the Word of God, His command and promise, cleanses the water of Baptism, no matter how impure it may be chemically, sanctifies it, makes it holy, pure water, and endows it with a power far transcending that of natural water or of the ceremonial waters of the Old Covenant. While the water of Baptism is also applied to the body, yet it cleanses not from the filth of the flesh, 1 Pet. 3:21, nor from ceremonial uncleanness, but from sin, which contaminates not only the soul, but the body as well. The body is the seat of the heart, that deceitful thing and desperately wicked, Jer. 17:9; Gen. 8:21; Matt. 15:19. Through the members of the body the soul expresses its life, so that the body is by nature the servant of uncleanness and iniquity, Rom. 6:19. As the heart has been sprinkled, so the body has been washed with the pure water of Baptism, 1 Cor. 6:11. Together with its members, it is a member of Christ's body, 1 Cor. 6:13-20. Ought that not to

encourage us boldly to come to the throne of God? Ought Christians, so highly honored, ever consider the thought of forsaking their High Priest?

Though Baptism is administered only once, yet the cleansing effects of Baptism continue through life, Rom. 6:1 ff. Both verbs, sprinkle and wash, are in the form of perfect participles, expressing a continuing result of an action which has taken place in the past. As the blood shed by Cain attached itself to the murderer and continued to curse and condemn him, so the blood of Jesus, speaking better things than Abel, 12:24, attaches itself and still adheres to us, crying to God for mercy and speaking peace and comfort to our soul. Therefore at all times we may draw near to God's throne, and on the Last Day we can stand unashamed before His judgment-seat, for our hearts have been sprinkled, our bodies have been washed.

The writer purposely uses the *passive* perfect participle. We have not sprinkled ourselves nor washed our own bodies, as little as the Old Testament people and priests washed and sprinkled themselves. It was Moses, the mediator, that washed and sprinkled them, and it was Christ, who is our High Priest and Mediator in one person, who has sprinkled us. We have been purely passive. We could not have washed our bodies thoroughly enough nor sprinkled our hearts as perfectly as God demands. If it depended on our own efforts, we could never have that full assurance of faith necessary to draw near to God. That is possible only because the Son of God has performed this sprinkling. He is the Author and Finisher of our faith, as He alone is the Captain of our salvation. There is no reason, therefore, to hesitate and fear the approach to God. Come at all times. You have been cleansed; you are pure and holy and pleasing to God,—draw near.

Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; for He is faithful that promised, v. 23. "Let us hold fast." Κατέχειν means to hold back, retain, keep one from going away, Luke 4:42; hence, to hold fast, keep firmly in possession. "The profession," δμολογία, may denote the act of confession or the matter confessed. Here evidently the latter sense is the intended one, since "hold fast" requires an object entrusted to one. It is doubtful whether the writer had in mind a particular form of confession, a creed, though some commentators see in 1 Tim. 6:12 and other passages a reference to a confessional creed in use already in the ancient Church.

"Hold fast the confession of faith." The original has ἐλπίδος, hope, faith with regard to the future. Our Christian faith is at the same time hope. We confess Christ not only as our Redeemer who has in the past accomplished our salvation, not only as our

Priest and King who governs, guards, and preserves us during this life. We confess Christ Jesus, ever the same, 13:8, whose service does not end with death nor with the end of the world. We profess a hope that goes beyond death, beyond the grave, beyond time; that hope to which the writer has so often called the attention of his readers, 3:14 to 4:11; 6:9-20; 9:28; 11:9-16, etc. A glorious hope indeed, a hope distinctively a Christian hope. The unbeliever has no hope worthy of the name, Eph. 2:11, 12. The hope we confess is based on the work of our great High Priest, the Author in every sense of the word of our faith and hope. This is a hope worthy indeed of our unashamed confession; a hope which, just because it is a living hope, 1 Pet. 1:3, will urge us on to confess it before all the world, no matter what the consequences may be. This hope is to be unwavering, ἀκλινής. In chap. 11:34 we read that the believers of the Old Testament turned to flight, ἐκλιναν, the armies. Our profession should not be turned to flight, should not be bent back, should not retreat before the enemy's attacks, be they ever so fierce. It is to be firm and unwavering. Neither the plausible arguments of logic nor the assured deductions of philosophy, neither the ridicule of science nor the doubting questions of our own reason, should influence us to let the banner of our profession droop, to give way, if it be but an inch, to the enemy within or without. Unwavering let the profession of our hope be, Job 19:25-27; 1 Cor. 15; John 11:25, 26.

"For He is faithful that promised." The apostle adds this as a special inducement to hold fast our glorious profession. God will keep His promises, God will raise up our dead bodies and give us eternal life though we cannot understand how that is possible; for God is faithful, Num. 23:19 and 2 Cor. 1:20.

And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works, v. 24. "Let us consider." Κατανοέω is a stronger term than the simple verb; it means to fix one's mind upon an object, to regard intently. "To provoke one another." That is the duty of every Christian. A child of God has duties not only toward himself; cp. Phil. 2:12; 2 Pet. 1:10. Intimately connected with the care for our own soul, so as to be an essential part of it, is the consideration of our neighbor's spiritual welfare. That is a part of God's will, a phase of our Christian life, 2 Pet. 1:7, named as one of the things to be added to our faith, vv. 5-9. Nothing is more foreign to the spirit of Christianity than that selfish aloofness and cold-hearted self-consideration that asks: Gen. 4:9. We are our brother's keepers. And we are not only to admonish our brother when he has trespassed; we are to keep him from sinning; yes, we are even to be a stimulation to him unto love and good works. That is to be the purpose of our interest and regard for our fellow-

Christian, as indicated by the εἰς παροξυσμόν, "to provoke." The verb means to make sharp; the noun, occurring only here and Acts 15:39, something that sharpens, a stimulation, an incitement. Like in the English *provoke*, the action may be directed toward evil, as in Acts 15:39, or toward good, as here. The word is not used in the sense of the English *paroxysm*, denoting a periodic, violent attack, a fit, of activity, comparable to a mountain stream, which after a heavy rainfall rushes on, overflowing its banks, overwhelming everything it meets, spreading ruin and disaster, only to die down as suddenly and completely as it grew into a raging stream and leaving only a dry and waterless bed in its wake. Such periodic attacks of Christian activity usually do more harm than good. They prevent the generation of spiritual life or destroy existing sound Christian activity by their very violence just as surely as they fail to bring any one to the life in Christ or kill the enthusiasm of many a fellow-Christian by the long periods of inactivity intervening between the sporadic efforts at turning the world upside down. Not by sensational revivals, stirring up the emotions to the highest pitch and then as suddenly returning to the old lethargy and spiritual sleep, is the Church built. The Christian's life and his influence on his fellow-Christians is rather to be like the calm, steady flow of the river that went out of Eden to water the garden, itself a beauteous sight, stimulating vegetation to bring forth its best, generating beauty, fruitfulness, wherever its life-giving waters exerted their power. In like manner Christians are to provoke one another "unto love and good works," love to God and their fellow-men, that love which is the fulfilment of the Law, Rom. 13:10; Micah 6:8. This love finds expression in good works, acceptable to God and approved of men, to which Scripture exhorts in such passages as Gal. 5:22-25; Phil. 4:8, 9; Col. 3:10 to 4:6, etc.

Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another, and so much the more as ye see the Day approaching, v. 25. "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together." The word ἐκ συναγωγῆς is found only here and in 2 Thess. 2:1 and in 2 Macc. 2:7. It denotes the gathering together into one place, here the assembling of the Christian congregation for public worship. Perhaps the writer did not use the simple form συναγωγή in order to distinguish the meeting of the Christians from the synagog meetings of the Jews; but cp. Jas. 2:2. The Christians assembled daily for their meetings, in which the Word of God was preached and applied, the Sacraments administered, Acts 2:42-47, and the business of the congregation transacted, Matt. 18:17; Acts 11:22; 14:23, 27; 15:1 f., etc. The members of the congregation took a very active part in these

meetings, Acts 15:4, 5, 22; 25:30, 31; 1 Cor. 14:23-35; 1 Tim. 2:8. These meetings of the congregation are not to be "forsaken." The writer uses a very strong term, the same word used 13:5; Matt. 27:41; 2 Tim. 4:10, 16, to leave utterly and completely, desert, abandon. He uses the present participle, expressing the continued, habitual desertion. He uses neither the plural nor the singular noun without the article. They did not only make it a habit of absenting themselves occasionally from a meeting or from several meetings. They forsook τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν. The article designates the meeting as an institution, an institution which is so well-known a characteristic of the Christian congregation and demanded by the very fact that they are the household of God, brethren and sisters in Christ Jesus. He warns against habitually absenting oneself from this assembling, this gathering together, of Christians. That was already the "manner," the custom, "of some." Some had given up fellowship with their brethren. Perhaps they feared persecution if they attended the meetings of the Christians; perhaps they had for some other reason lost interest in these gatherings. The writer warns them, and especially those who were in danger of adopting this custom: Let us not be habitual forsakers of the assembling of ourselves. Occasional neglect in attending the church service may readily lead to complete departure from Christian fellowship. Cp. 2 Tim. 4:10.

"Rather let us exhort one another." Παρακαλεῖν comprises much more than exhortation. It means originally to call one to one's side, the exact purpose being brought out in the context. In 1 Cor. 14:31; 1 Thess. 3:2, the ideas of exhortation and comfort and encouragement are combined. In our passage the word combines the ideas of instructing, exhorting, warning, comforting, one another. Christians ought to gather together much more frequently for the purpose of mutual edification. By word and deed, by speech and example, they ought to "call aside," personally instruct, etc., their fellow-Christians and thus incite them unto love and good works. This they are to do because they have the joyous assurance spoken of in vv. 19-21. Why should they not help others to remain faithful and diligent pilgrims on the one and only way opened to them by the blood of Jesus? Why should not love and gratitude to their great High Priest urge them to keep their brethren on the right way?

This solicitous care for the welfare of the brethren is motivated in the closing words of the epistle lesson: "so much the more as you see the Day approaching." "The Day," the final Day, the Day of Judgment, the end of the world, is in process of approaching. It may be a matter of only a few years or days or moments before the Day will come. What little time they have

should not be used in the service of sin, should not be spent in a life of estrangement from Jesus. In the same measure as the signs of Christ's second coming are being fulfilled, — and they see the Day approaching, — they should be in readiness, 2 Pet. 3:10-14; for that will be the day of their complete, everlasting redemption, Luke 21:28; Rom. 8:18. In view of this fast-approaching Day, every Christian ought to follow the admonition of the writer, v. 24, so that he, like his High Priest, may say: Heb. 2:13 b; John 17:12.

This beautiful passage is admirably chosen as the text for the first message in the Advent season, the opening Sunday of the new church-year. Like the standard Gospel-lesson it presents to the congregation *The Glorious Advent Message*. It speaks of the King who is also our High Priest, and it exhorts us to come to Him and vow faithful allegiance to Him. One may word the theme thus: *Confidently We Enter into the New Church-year with Our Great High Priest*. He is the firm Foundation of our faith. He is the never-failing Fountain of our hope. He is the perennial Well-spring of our love. — Many contracts and pacts are only temporary, ending at the close of the year. Not so God's covenant. Is. 54:5-10. *At the Portals of the New Church-year Our High Priest Greets Us*. He assures us that the way to the throne of God is still open for us, 19-22. He pleads with us to remain His loyal servants, 23-25. — God's mercy was new every morning in the old church-year, also this morning. Lam. 3:22, 23. *At the Beginning of the New Church-year let Us Pledge Anew Our Loyalty*. Let us make diligent use of the way He opened for us. Let no one rob us of the profession of our faith. Let us incite others to true discipleship (and for this purpose attend church regularly). — *Let Us Hold Fast the Profession of Our Faith*. Because then alone the way to God will remain open to us. Because then alone we shall help others to walk this way. — Were the services attended as well during the last year as they ought to have been? *In the New Church-year let Us Not Neglect Church Attendance*. In church we meet our great High Priest. Here we are encouraged to a living faith and hope. Here we can incite our brethren to love and good works.

TH. LAETSCH

Predigtentwurf für den ersten Advents Sonntag

Lut. 1, 67—80

(Thomasius-Perikopenreihe)

Ein neues Kirchenjahr! Wir denken besonders an das, was uns während der kommenden zwölf Monate im Geistlichen bevorsteht. Was ist es, Wachstum oder Rückgang in der Erkenntnis, Stärkung oder Ab-

nahme im Glauben, Förderung in der Heiligung oder Erhaltung der Liebe, ein festes Voraneilen auf dem schmalen Weg oder eine allmähliche oder vielleicht auch plötzliche Schwentung zum breiten Weg hinüber, der zur Verdammnis führt? Mit solchen ernststen Gedanken beginnt der aufrichtige Christ das neue Kirchenjahr. Wenn wirklich der Advent Jesu stattfindet und er aufs neue bei uns einzieht, so hat es keine Not. Unser Text zeigt uns,

Wie wichtig es ist, daß wir das neue Kirchenjahr mit Jesu beginnen und vollenden

Er verschafft uns nämlich

1. Erlösung von unsern Feinden;
2. Erkenntnis des Heils;
3. Heiligkeit und Gerechtigkeit, die Gott gefällig sind.

I

Unser Text enthält den schönen Lobgesang (Benedictus), den Zacharias nach der Beschneidung seines Söhnleins Johannes anstimmte. Das Lied zeigt, was Gott durch den nun erscheinenden Messias aufrichten werde und was die Tätigkeit des Johannes sein solle. Vor allen Dingen ist es das erstere, was Zacharias in berechneten Worten preist. Er redet von der Erlösung, die durch den Messias ausgeführt werden würde. Zu beachten sind die Ausdrücke „erlösen“, „retten“, „Richt in der Finsternis“ und „im Schatten des Todes“.

Was ist damit gemeint? Es ist klar, daß Zacharias in bildlichen Ausdrücken redet. Seine Worte möchten auf den ersten Blick allerdings eine leibliche, irdische Deutung erfordern, als ob er von einer feindlichen politischen Macht redete. Aber B. 77 zeigt, daß er von geistlichen Dingen handelt, von der Sünde und Befreiung von ihrer Schuld, Strafe und Herrschaft. Der Sinn der Worte ist: Erkenntnis des Heils, die in Vergebung ihrer Sünde besteht (so die Hirschberger Bibel). Die Sünde ist eine schreckliche Macht, die uns verflucht und verdammt. Christus bringt Rettung.

Darum wird er auch das Horn des Heils genannt, B. 69. Horn ist ein Symbol der Stärke. Man denke an einen Stier, der mit den Hörnern seinen Gegner vernichtet. Jesus ist der Heil und Rettung bringende mächtige Kämpfer.

Wie gewiß ist doch dies alles! Schon die Propheten haben davon geweissagt, vom Heiligen Geist getrieben, B. 70. Gott selber hat einen Bund gemacht, der gerade diese Hilfe in sich schloß, B. 72. Vgl. Gen. 17, 7. — Er hat sein Versprechen bestätigt durch einen Eid, B. 73. Vgl. Gen. 22, 16. — So haben wir keinen Grund, an der Wahrheit dieser Botschaft von Jesu Rettung zu zweifeln.

Gilt dies aber auch für uns und nicht etwa bloß für Israel? Wie B. 79 zeigt, ist dies Heil bestimmt für alle, die da sitzen in Finsternis und im Schatten des Todes, also für alle Menschen.

Da Jesus der Retter ist, sind wir bei ihm geborgen.

2

Auch Erkenntnis des Heils wird dieser Retter verleihen. Zacharias beschreibt B. 76 f. das zukünftige Werk seines Söhnleins. Er sagt, dies Kindlein werde Erkenntnis des Heils bringen.

Johannes hat das getan. Aber freilich stand er im Dienst eines Höheren. Er war nur Wegbereiter, Handlanger, Diener. Er konnte nur, wie er selbst sagt, mit Wasser taufen, das heißt, nur das äußerliche Werk verrichten; den Heiligen Geist, der auch in seiner Taufe geschenkt wurde, mußte der Messias geben. So ist es doch Christus selbst, der durch seinen Diener diese Erkenntnis verleiht.

Während die Erlösung außerhalb unserer Person, auf Golgatha, zustande kam, findet Erkenntnis des Heils in uns statt. Es ist damit nichts anderes gemeint als der Glaube selbst. Vgl. Joh. 17, 3. Es ist hier mehr bezeichnet als Erkenntnis des Kopfes, nämlich Herzenserkenntnis, die ein Ergreifen Jesu in sich schließt.

Ohne Glauben gibt es keine Seligkeit, Joh. 3, 36. Jesus schenkt uns diesen Glauben oder diese Erkenntnis durch die Gnadenmittel, besonders durch das von seinen Dienern gepredigte Wort. Wird das neue Jahr mit ihm angefangen und fortgesetzt, dann hat es auch in diesem Stück keine Not.

3

Der Messias wird auch dies verleihen, daß wir Gott dienen in Heiligkeit und Gerechtigkeit, die ihm gefällig sind, B. 75. Wo der Glaube ist, da ist auch wahrer Dienst Gottes, da ist man der Sünde gestorben und lebt Gott in Christo Jesu, unserm Herrn, Röm. 6, 11.

Obwohl gute Werke nicht in den Himmel hineinbringen, sind sie doch unumgänglich notwendig. Sie fließen nämlich ganz von selbst aus dem Glauben.

Wie schwer ist doch ein Wandel in Heiligkeit und Gerechtigkeit angesichts der vielen Versuchungen und Schlingen Satans! Christus schenkt den Seinen das Wollen und das Vollbringen für einen solchen Wandel. Zacharias redet hier von als von einer Gabe Gottes, B. 73. Auch die Werke der Heiligung sind ein Geschenk von oben.

An der Hand des Heilandes brauchen wir also nicht zu verzagen. Er wird uns alles geben, was nötig ist. Im Hinblick auf ihn treten wir getrost ins neue Kirchenjahr ein.

W. Arndt



Miscellanea

Science and Christian Education

This was the subject upon which Dr. Arthur H. Compton, professor of physics at the University of Chicago, spoke at the closing session of the International Convention of Christian Education held here in Columbus last week. Dr. Compton is a scientist of the first water, winner of the 1927 Nobel prize in science and renowned for his work in connection with the cosmic ray. The burden of his message before this international gathering of religious educators was that science has given new powers to man, but that Christianity is the key to the proper use of these enlarged powers. It was extremely heartening to hear this eminent scientist develop this proposition. To be sure, he spoke as a scientist, not as a theologian. He tried to give us the viewpoint of a man of science, telling us that scientists regard science as the basis of civilization and the primary factor in stimulating its growth. He traced the rapid, far-reaching advances that have been made, for example, in the field of physics — in heat, light, and electricity — in the last fifty years and stated that these advances have powerfully influenced our intellectual, economic, and social life and contributed much to human welfare. But then the learned scientist from Chicago at once admitted that the key to the future of man lies not only in the increased knowledge and increased strength which science has put at our disposal but *in the use which man makes of that knowledge and strength*. The new powers which science has given to man may be, and have been, abused by cruel men and by selfish, short-sighted nations, averred Dr. Compton. And in this indictment he included not only Germany and Russia but our own country as well, for he admitted a rather universal tendency on the part of mankind to divide into antagonistic groups, in which men become terribly destructive. Science, in other words, has demonstrated the tremendous need of cooperation and has helped to show the rich rewards which cooperation, consideration of one another, brings; but the real key to effecting this cooperation, this brotherly love, is Christian education. The eminent physicist made an eloquent plea for that which Paul prays for in his letter to the Philippians: "It is my prayer that your love may be more and more rich in knowledge and all manner of insight" (Phil. 1:9, Moffatt's translation). He insisted that love alone isn't enough; it must be enriched by increasing knowledge and insight. But knowledge alone isn't enough either; it must be motivated by Christian love. Hence science, which has brought about a technological society and demonstrated the mutual dependence of the members of such a society upon each other, shows how absolutely indispensable Christian education is if our increased knowledge and strength is to benefit rather than hurt society.

Remember once again, these words came not from a theological professor or a minister or a Sunday-school superintendent but from a world-renowned scientist. Perhaps, had he told us more fully what

he understands by Christian education, what the content of such education is, we would not have seen eye to eye with him. But his telling argument for the need of Christian education stands nevertheless. In fact, if we Lutherans have the precise message — the life-giving, power-bestowing Gospel of Jesus Christ in all its saving fulness — that our world needs to save it from chaos despite its advance in scientific knowledge and technique, it becomes us to be particularly zealous in giving this message to our children and college youth, to our fathers and mothers, that they in turn may be used in helping others to see and follow the light. — *Lutheran Standard*.

The Body of Christ in the Holy Supper

The question has been raised: "Which is the form in which we receive the body of Christ and His blood in Holy Communion? Is it the natural body of the Son of God, as it hung on the Cross, or is it the glorified form in which we receive it?"

The question concerns the peculiar mode of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper. In it neither the real presence nor the oral manducation is being denied. It has been said: "Since Christ is now glorified, He can give us no other than His glorified body today." Such reasoning in matters of doctrine is out of place; for not any logical deduction from an unwritten premise, but Scripture, in its clear declaration, is our *principium cognoscendi*, or our norm of faith. The syllogism in this case reads: 1. Christ is now glorified. 2. He cannot be present in any other way than in His glorified body. 3. Therefore in the Holy Supper we receive His glorified body. Evidently the minor premise is not stated in Scripture. It must be noted that the Scriptures carefully determine the body given us in the Holy Supper when in the words of institution it specifies "the body given for you," "the blood shed for you."

Dr. Pieper, in his *Christliche Dogmatik* (III, 415), writes very properly: "Also with regard to the *materia coelestis* it is necessary for us to adhere to the words of institution and to repudiate all substitutes invented by men." Among the substitutes put in place of Christ's true body given for us and His true blood shed for us he mentions also the "glorified body of Christ" or the "glorified corporeity" of Christ or the "glorified Christ," etc. "Calvin," he says, "holds that the powers of the glorified body of Christ infuse themselves into the believing soul, while modern theologians speak of the pneumatico-physical efficacy of the Lord's Supper, for the reason that in this Sacrament the glorified body of Christ is said to be received. But the words of institution do not say anything of a glorified body, and neither the essence of the Holy Supper (the real presence) nor its salutary effect (remission of sins) should be based upon the glorification of the body of Christ. The fact that Christ's body was not yet glorified at the first Holy Communion did not prevent the real presence of the body and blood; just so also the fact that Christ's body is now glorified does not promote (*foerdert nicht*) the real presence that occurs till the end of time whenever the Holy Supper is being celebrated in the Christian Church. The real presence has its fully adequate *rationale* in the words of institution:

'This is My body; this is My blood.' It is only when the Reformed object that a human body cannot be present at several places at the same time that we emphasize the fact that Christ's body is not merely a truly human body but also the body of the *Son of God*, to which Scripture expressly ascribes divine attributes, including also *omnipresence*, just because of the *personal union*. Very rightly Dr. Walther declares: 'The presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper must not be based upon the glorified state of Christ's body. The glorification imparts to Christ's body only spiritual, not divine properties. We believe that Christ's body is present and received in the Holy Supper 1. because of Christ's promise; 2. because Christ's body is the body of God's Son.' To this Dr. Walther adds the warning: 'Divines, such as Sartorius and others, who in general have written much that is excellent, use the glorified state of Christ's body as a support (*Stuetze*) of His presence in the Holy Supper. But that is a false prop, and false props are just as dangerous as are open contradictions. It is incorrect to say that Christ can now give us His body in the Holy Supper because He is glorified. In this erroneous argumentation there is implied that Christ could not give us His body as long as this was not yet glorified, and this would abrogate the first celebration of the Holy Supper.' Even if now the communicants receive also the glorified body because the glorified body is identical with the non-glorified, nevertheless, according to the words of institution, the body concerns us not inasmuch as it is glorified, but inasmuch as it was given for us into death for our reconciliation (*als der zu unserer Versoehnung dahingegebene*), τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, that is to say, as the *pledge* and *means* of the remission of sins.' This fine presentation, we are sure, dispels whatever doubts may exist in the minds of some regarding the peculiar mode of Christ's presence in the Holy Supper.

In two extensive footnotes Dr. Pieper quotes Kromayer as urging against the Calvinists that even a spiritual body is *eo ipso* not yet omnipresent. In fact, Christ has His majestic body (His omnipresent body) not from His glorification but from the personal union with the Logos and the session at the right hand of God. So also Burger (RE² I, 37) says that the possibility of the omnipresence rests not upon the glorification of Christ but upon the personal union and the mutual communication and permeation of the divine and human natures in the unity of His person. Both quotations shed valuable light upon the issue. We maintain that Christ is truly present in the Lord's Supper because of His express promise to that effect in the words of institution. We maintain that it is the *true body* of Christ that is present because He describes the body as that *given into death*. We defend the possibility of the real presence (omnipresence) by the personal union, which embraces the communion of natures and the communication of attributes, in particular the *genus maiestaticum*.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

I. Amerika

The Lutheran World Convention and World-Wide Lutheran Cooperation.—Something of the unique and important function of the Lutheran World Convention is indicated in the following excerpts from the official report of the latest meeting of the executive committee, prepared by Dr. Hans Lilje, general secretary:

"Among the topics for discussion three had particular prominence this year. The first question is related to the reorganization of the World Convention. It has become apparent in the course of the now nearly twenty years' history of the World Convention that a more solid constitutional basis is needed for the fulfilment of its extensive task than has hitherto been the case. But for a union of such varied church structures, from all parts of the world, to build up a common constitution is no light task. . . . Two difficulties in particular have come to the fore in the course of negotiations. The first is of an exterior and legal nature. The proceedings which could bring about a union of the Lutheran churches are extraordinarily varied. Some involve a parliamentary decree, while others may only require the decision of the directing group and others again merely the consent of the leading pastoral authorities. Still more important is the difference in the conception of the fellowship of the churches, which presents a much greater difficulty than an outsider would think. For over against the large-mindedness and breadth of the Swedish and of some other Nordic churches, which have official intercommunion with the Church of England, there is at the other extreme the determination to refuse intercommunion with those Lutheran churches which admit non-Lutherans to Communion. And finally there is yet another exterior difficulty. Informal union has been fully adequate for relief work hitherto and has avoided a number of fundamental difficulties. But it has become very clear that the Lutheran World Convention needs a more solid constitutional foundation if it is to do its future work with the broad-mindedness and authority that is required. The realization of this fact led to the discussion of a new-draft constitution, which is to be submitted to the next meeting of the World Convention in 1940.

"This fourth convention will be the greatest and most important assembly in the history of Lutheranism.

"The second main topic for discussion was the relief work of the World's Convention on behalf of those Lutheran churches which are in need of it, such as those in the Ukraine or on the mission-field. The third topic was the preparation of the coming World Convention, which is to meet in Philadelphia in May, 1940. (The first was held at Eisenach in 1923, the second in Copenhagen in 1929, and the third in Paris in 1935.) The agenda include, under the general theme of 'The Lutheran Church Today,' the discussion of the following subjects: 'The Church and the Churches,' 'Church, Word, and Sacrament,' 'The Church in the World.' The program also provides for special meetings for Lutheran youth, on

the work of foreign missions, on the diaconate, on home missions, press, statistics, church instruction of the people's mission."

The above is taken from the *News Bulletin* of the National Lutheran Council. God grant that, when this Lutheran World Convention will be held in Philadelphia in 1940, the aim of those who attend will not be the creation of a large Lutheran body of world-wide dimensions but the fostering of loyalty to the old truths revealed in the Scriptures and confessed in the Lutheran symbols and the promulgation of these truths to a distracted and bewildered world. A.

The Tragedy of New Sweden.—Speaking of the defection of the Lutheran Church on the Delaware founded by the Swedes in the colony which was established three hundred years ago, President Bersell of the Augustana Synod is quoted in the *Lutheran Companion* of June 30 to have spoken as follows:

"The tragedy of the Delaware churches, from a Lutheran point of view, was caused by a spirit of unionism and a weakening of confessional loyalty, which led to a 'foreign entanglement' with Anglicanism, that eventually swallowed these churches. When the Delaware churches passed under Episcopal jurisdiction, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania had been in existence for many years. If the Swedish Lutherans had made common cause with their German Lutheran brethren, . . . the story of these Lutheran churches would have been gloriously different.

"The important thing today, however, is that we may have learned the lesson. Neither isolation as a synod nor unionism with other groups will help us. Either will destroy us eventually. The best way for the Lutheran and Reformed church-bodies to promote true ecumenicity is for the church groups who possess a common faith to get together and settle whatever differences they may have. Denominational, not sectarian, loyalty must be a living reality, a foundation for the larger contacts." A.

Wartburg Theological Seminary Mourns.—This seminary of the American Lutheran Church suffered the loss of its president, the Rev. Dr. Emil H. Rausch, who departed this life August 19, sixty-three years old. He was a graduate of Wartburg Seminary and had later studied at the University of Michigan. He had served as pastor in Peoria, Ill., Marine City, Mich., and Waverly, Iowa. From 1909 to 1910 he was the associate editor of the *Lutheran Herald* and from 1910 to 1926 its editor-in-chief. A.

Rev. J. E. Thoen Resigns the Editorship of the "Sentinel" and "Tidende." In Vol. 21, No. 15 (Aug. 12, 1938) of the *Lutheran Sentinel* the announcement is made that Rev. J. E. Thoen, after almost eight years of faithful service, feels obliged to resign from the editorship of the two official organs of the *Norwegian Synod*. In commendation of his work the periodical says among other things: "The effects of his editorial pen have been far-reaching. Law and Gospel have been presented plainly and clearly to the encouragement of sound Lutheranism and to the discouragement of all such as would depart from pure teaching and holy living. As a fearless warrior J. E. Thoen has held fast to an editorial policy which claimed respect for *Sentinel* and *Tidende* far beyond the

boundaries of our own Synod. As a kindly seeker of souls he has not only written and selected articles which told about the general state of the Church, but he has seen to it that there has been a consistent presentation of salvation by grace through faith in Christ Jesus."

Aged Pastor J. E. Thoen fully deserves this praise, and we are glad that he has promised his cheerful cooperation with the new editor, Rev. A. M. Harstad, in the department of Christian doctrine and polemics. In No. 16 of the *Lutheran Sentinel* (Aug. 27) we find a splendid article from his facile pen on *Woman's Suffrage and the Lutheran Church*, showing that the Lutheran Church in Norway is now being urged to grant permission to women to study theology and enter the ministry. Till now the *Storting* (Norwegian Congress) as well as the College of Bishops, the Congregational Council, and the Bishopric Councils have stood firm, and Dr. O. Hallesby, known in wide circles also in this country, has threatened to resign his position if the seminary will be forced to admit women as students of theology to be prepared to enter the ministry of the Church. Pastor Thoen adds to this the warning that such American Lutheran bodies as the United Lutheran Church and the Norwegian Lutheran Church, which permit women to vote and hold important office, may be up against the same question as the State Church in Norway. He writes in conclusion: "Let us not imagine that we shall be spared the need of defending ourselves against pressure from without regarding this question."

In Vol. 15 of the *Lutheran Sentinel* Rev. H. M. Tjernagel offers a timely and important article on "Our Pioneer Church Fathers," who, as he points out, were H. A. Preus, Jakob Aal Ottesen and, above all, Ulrik Vilhelm Koren. Of the latter he writes: "In the student-body at the University of Christiania he was known as 'loeven'—the 'lion.' To his intimates he was the gifted earnest seeker after Christian faith and knowledge. His slogan became 'Grace alone!' As those words are engraved on the obelisk which marks his resting-place in the Washington Prairie Cemetery, so was the truth expressed by these words the background to every sermon he preached, every article he wrote,—and there were many,—and every battle he waged against false doctrine through a long militant life. Lutheranism has had few spokesmen in this or any other land that have excelled Koren in wielding the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. Though in form, features, and bearing he was the very incarnation of the Viking chieftain and was often misjudged because of his commanding presence, yet he was in reality a mellowed, humble Christian, a mendicant at the cross of Jesus Christ."

Dr. Koren, by the way, was pastor at Washington Prairie, Iowa, from 1853 to 1910, fifty-seven years. He was the first Norwegian pastor to settle west of the Mississippi River. He procured the campus for Decorah Luther College, was President of the Norwegian Synod, professor at Luther College in 1874 and 1875, the author of poems, articles, and books, and throughout the predestination controversy, as long as he lived, the chief champion among the Norwegians of the Lutheran doctrine of conversion and election. Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, conferred upon him the title of Doctor of Divinity in 1903. It is well also for us to remember

such men as Koren and Herman Amberg Preus and many others who built up true Lutheranism in our country. By the way, H. A. Preus was one of the organizers of the Norwegian Synod and its second President, coeditor of *Maanedstidende*, 1859—1868, author of many articles and pamphlets, and President of the Synodical Conference, in which he proposed the establishment of our Negro Missions in 1877. J. T. M.

Ἑγγραπται. — The *Lutheran* of August 3 reprints from the *Lutheran Herald* of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America the editorial contributed by the editor, Dr. G. T. Lee, at the twenty-fifth anniversary of his assumption of the editorship. This editorial was the *Introductory* printed July 10, 1913. Here it is: "*Introductory.* It is customary for a new editor to outline his program. But in our case we consider the program already outlined in all essentials. The synod meeting at Minneapolis decided that the *Lutheran Herald* should be the English organ of the synod. Accordingly it will be our duty to voice the sentiments and proclaim the principles for which the synod stands. The motto of the synod is the Greek word *ἑγγραπται*, which means 'It is written.' The Word of God is the only infallible source and norm of doctrine and rule of life. The *Lutheran Herald* is not to be our personal organ for voicing our views or opinions, but in all matters of faith and Christian life the *Herald* must speak as the Word of God. On all matters necessary to salvation the Word of God speaks with a perspicuity and directness which no man can improve upon. The Word of God shall be our only light, guide, and source of authority, not as interpreter but as it reads. Our interpretation of a plain Bible statement will be a repetition of the Bible words. Furthermore, the Scriptures furnish their own interpretation. In our days we are asked to seek the truth in the so-called Sacred Books of the East, to abide by the 'results of science,' to accept 'new revelations,' and to be guided by 'Christian consciousness.' But we shall not substitute the glow-worm of human sagacity and wisdom for the light shining from heaven in the Word of God. The sword of the spirit, the Word of God, shall be the weapon used to combat error and meet the temptations of Satan.

"A paper bearing the title 'Lutheran' must also necessarily give prominence to the second great truth which the Lutheran Church has always proclaimed: Salvation by grace alone, through faith in Jesus Christ. Persistently and consistently we shall emphasize these two fundamental principles of Lutheranism and apply them to present-day problems in our political, social, moral, and religious life." E.

Intersynodical Negotiations in Australia. — The *Australian Lutheran*, the paper of our brethren in Australia (the Evangelical Lutheran Synod in Australia), in its number of July 22, 1938, carried the following article:

"Intersynodical negotiations, which have the purpose of removing doctrinal differences and establishing unity, have again become possible since the chief obstacle, which for years prevented such negotiations, has been removed by the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia. When, prior to his departure for the Brisbane General Convention of the U. E. L. C. A. in September, 1937, I personally approached the President of the U. E. L. C. A. with the request to work towards the re-

removal of the Walla Walla resolution of the U. E. L. C. A., which, some eight or nine years ago, stopped intersynodical discussions, I found him very willing to do his best in this matter. After his return from that convention he informed me that his synod had declared the Walla Walla resolution 'inoperative' and had thus cleared the way for the resumption of intersynodical negotiations. In a letter dated February 8, 1938, President Stolz confirmed this information, supplying me with a copy of the official report of the U. E. L. C. A. According to this information their Committee for Intersynodical Negotiations had received free hand as to the time and the manner of the reopening of the discussions. He also stated that such discussions could only take place after the printed reply to our pamphlet, *The Differences*, had been placed on the market and that, when the time came, discussions by correspondence would most likely be preferred.

"Hence we may look forward with anticipation to the resumption of these negotiations which we on our part have never ceased to desire and to urge. We also believe, and always have advocated, that discussions of this nature would be most profitable if they were held in public, in the presence of lay members of our respective churches.

"In this connection we feel in duty bound to make reference to a laymen's movement which was inaugurated in February last by a circular issued by one of our South Australian laymen, in which he endeavored to interest laymen of both synods in favor of such intersynodical discussions. Subsequently a notice calling a laymen's meeting, to be held at a convenient time, for the purpose of furthering intersynodical negotiations and bringing about a union of the churches of the Lutheran persuasion in our land, was published and broadcast. We have studied the circular and notice and have also interviewed the writer. The result of our investigation is as follows:

"Much as we welcome the keen interest of our laymen in this important matter and recognize their, no doubt, good intentions, we cannot countenance, endorse, or support this movement. We are guided in our decision by the following considerations:

"1. In view of the information supplied in the first portion of this article the laymen's meeting to urge the resumption of intersynodical negotiations in the manner contemplated is not necessary.

"2. The circular sent out in February contains many statements which are directly contrary to fact and also passes judgments which are manifestly unjust. The blessings of God cannot rest on a foundation of that nature.

"3. The aims and objects of this laymen's movement are not clearly defined and, judging from our discussions, may be contrary to our doctrinal position and therefore fraught with danger to our Church and its individual members.

"4. The organization contemplated is to consist of laymen only and makes no provision for full cooperation with, and supervision by, the divinely called teachers of the Word and servants of the Church, and that in matters of the gravest import to the Church. This procedure we regard as being in disharmony with the universal practise of our Church,

1 Cor. 14:10; but, what is more, we fear that the plan underlying the movement is in conflict with the spirit of the Gospel, which describes the pastors as overseers, watchmen, stewards, etc., and makes it their duty to teach the truth and warn against error, etc. (Compare 1 Cor. 4:1; 14:10; Acts 20:28; Titus 1:9; Heb. 13:17; Jas. 3:1; Mal. 2:7.)

"We have always urged the participation of the laymen of both church-bodies in the intersynodical discussions; but we cannot see our way clear to give our support or endorsement to this movement, nor can we advise our congregations and church-members to do so.

"WM. JANZOW, *General President*"

When the Reformation Was in Flower.—Under this heading the (Roman Catholic) *Extension Magazine* (May, 1938) published an illustrated article on Luther's work, altogether unfair and derogatory to the great Reformer's glorious task. The article of course says no more than what Romanistic traducers long ago have said about Luther's reformation of the Church. The writer closes his remarks by saying: "My present purpose is more modest, namely, to show 1. that the Reformation failed of its chief aim, to destroy the Catholic religion and abolish the Church and Papacy; 2. that the Reformation divided Christendom and retarded the religious progress of mankind by setting the people not only of Germany but also the nations of the earth warring among themselves on account of religion; 3. that the Reformation fomented quarrels and engendered hatreds and bitterness, which are rampant throughout the world this very hour; 4. that the Reformation set in motion far-reaching forces of evil, which are today threatening to destroy what is still left of our so-called Christian civilization. When the Peasants' War was raging, Erasmus said to Luther, 'We are now reaping the fruits of the seed you have sown.' And so it may be said that the world is reaping the fruits of the seed which Luther sowed four hundred years ago. He sowed the wind; we reap the whirlwind."

What the writer here says, is of course downright slander and, historically considered, utterly ridiculous. Yet it is no more than what other and more notorious Romanistic historians have said of Luther and his work. Two things perhaps may be important enough to note in this connection, namely, 1. that we cannot afford to ignore what the Romanists even today publish about Luther and his great work in their papers and pamphlets; 2. that we ourselves may assist our Catholic neighbors in finding out the truth by passing on to them some of our own church-papers after we are through with them. Luther's Reformation is still the focal point in modern church history and deserves the most careful study by all who call themselves Protestants. It is here where confessional Protestantism and blind Romanism diverge, and no one dare remain neutral; for here truth stands in opposition to falsehood.

J. T. M.

Charles C. Marshall.—The press reports the death of Charles C. Marshall, recognized as an authority in ecclesiastical as well as civil law, who in 1928 challenged Alfred E. Smith when he was the presidential candidate of the Democratic party to show how he could be a faithful Roman Catholic and at the same time loyal to his oath of office if he

should be elected. He quoted from papal encyclicals and Roman church authorities to show that the two are incompatible. He perpetuated his conclusions in a book on the relation of the Roman Church to the Presidency under the title *The Roman Catholic Church in the Modern State*.

H.

Friendly Advice to the Jews.—Under this heading the Baptist *Watchman-Examiner* writes: "It is of little use for Jews in this country to cry out for tolerance and then for them to practise intolerance among themselves. No Jew ought to be persecuted by fellow-Jews because God has come into his life through faith in Jesus Christ."

H.

A Significant Item.—The Catholic *America* reports, July 30, 1938: "A recent Congressional amendment, signed by President Roosevelt, permits the American consulate in Rome to act as the authenticating agent for documents of record in Vatican City in order that the documents may be used as evidence in United States courts. The amendment commences with the words: 'Until the United States shall have a consular representative resident in the State of Vatican City.' The last American Minister to the Vatican was Rufus King of Wisconsin, appointed by Abraham Lincoln in 1863."

H.

One Way of Cleaning House.—A correspondent of the Open Forum in the Baptist *Watchman-Examiner* calls on the laymen of the Church to emulate the example of the Thessalonian Christians, who checked up on Paul's preaching to see if what he said was the truth. He says: "It is quite the thing to blame the colleges and seminaries for unsound preachers and teachers; but I maintain that three fourths of the blame should be placed on the members of the churches. Suppose at the close of a service a dozen of my members should come to me with their Bibles open and should say, 'Pastor, we have checked on what you said, and we find that you are wrong. The Word of God says thus and so.' One of two things would result: I would either get straightened out in my theology, or else I would resign and go where nobody would search the Scripture to see if what I said was the truth." It is often said when the heterodox views of certain preachers (including some Lutherans) become evident: Their people do not hold those views; they are more orthodox.—Well, this points the way which they should go and deal with their pastors. Only this in addition: If their pastor is not honest enough to adopt one of the two things proposed by the writer, his parishioners should give him an energetic push or leave his company. And others who hold the same conviction might help the process along; thus the writer might start a movement by which the Baptists could rid their Church of preachers like Harry Emerson Fosdick.

H.

Strong Protest against Membership in the Federal Council of Churches.—We are glad to reprint what Dr. Mark A. Matthews of Seattle, Wash., one of the prominent Presbyterian ministers of today, writes under the caption "The Fire Hazard Is Too Great." Unfortunately we cannot insert his article in its entirety. His vigorous statements furnish evidence that not all knees have bowed to Baal in those denominations that are connected with the Federal Council. His article appeared in the *Presbyterian* of August 4, 1938.

"Much of the world is now burning. The Church cannot afford to play with the fires of heresy, Modernism, rationalism, Communism, atheism, Fascism, Naziism, or anarchy. Their fires are far more ominous and far more foreboding than the picture above described of the burning forests. We ought not to be connected with anything that has in it the dangers, the fire hazards, the combustible matter, contained in the false religions and heresies of today. One of the greatest heresies is the denial of the infallibility of the Scriptures.

"We have no right to be connected with the so-called Federal Council of Churches in America. The *exposé* of the Council has been very carefully and cautiously made, and unrefutable facts have been presented. Read *The Red Network*. Read Mr. Sanctuary's marvelous and convincing *exposé* of the facts. Read the articles and books convicting the Federal Council of Churches in America and exposing the Communists in the organization and the communistic trends of the organization. We cannot afford to be connected with such an institution or an institution that has men in it of such radical, rationalistic views. The fire hazards are too great.

"There is not any value in playing with fire. Too much property is being destroyed; too many lives are being jeopardized; too many interests are being injured, and too many principles are being singed.

"Up to the present minute the Presbyterian Church has stood aloof from these nefarious, hellish religions — Socialism, Communism, Fascism, atheism, Naziism, and anarchy. Some of the great denominations have been wrecked, and others are being wrecked, by contact with such. Our denomination has stood aloof from these evil influences, and that aloofness has in the past gained us respect and confidence. But every time our name is connected with the socialistic or communistic trends of the Federal Council, we suffer. The fire hazards are too great. The Presbyterian Church stands on the great fundamental principles of God's infallible Word and the matchless Constitution and principles of our American representative government. Such views, doctrines, and creeds are essential to America; therefore we cannot afford to make any compromises." A.

Important Factors in Denominational Union. — Speaking of the latter subject, of growing importance also to the various Baptist groups, the *Watchman-Examiner* (Sept. 8, 1938) says among other things: "At the recent meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention, Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke of London declared that the Edinburgh Conference had done positive harm, the pressure for mechanical union having widened the cleavages which divide Christians. By such pressure the origin of Protestantism was hastened in Europe and many of the numerous denominations in America are the result of the same pressure in Puritan New England. Careful reflection will disclose other effects of the persistent campaign against religious denominations. As these bodies were originated to give expression to deep convictions which would not down and to which their adherents vowed their loyalty at any cost, the effect of this campaign has been to smother such convictions and tamper with the supreme loyalties of the soul. Colleges founded by denominational gifts compromise themselves by announcing themselves undenominational, and

their religious responsibility and influence have become a decreasing variable, approaching irreligion as its limit. In an age when fundamental loyalties to duty, to right, to family and society, are lightly held, encouragement to further disloyalty serves to weaken all moral and religious obligations, threatens society with disruption, and is a positive blight upon the character of the individual. Preachers of undenominationalism reduce the Gospel-message to a neutral tone and offer an evanescent religion like the patriotism of the man without a country. The truth is soft-pedaled or submerged. Their appeal may contain an element of truth but for that reason is more subtle and deceptive. Their position is so plausible that they who resist its deductions are open to the charge of being antiquated or conservative. As a result the nominal, inactive membership of a church is increased at the expense of its vital strength. Members lose interest in a particular church, with the explanation that they attend all the churches. At length they divest themselves of all church responsibility. The denominational paper becomes too narrow and is displaced with some semireligious publication. The missionary nerve is severed, the denominational outpost is called in, and a missionary church surrenders its great commission. How much of the recent decline in support of the local church and missionary giving is due to the prolonged attack upon denominational loyalty may never be known, and because it is known, the decline continues in spite of organized resistance."

This certainly most just and objective declaration of vital truths was suggested to Rev. C. T. Brownell, D. D., the author of the article, by a number of facts, which in an introductory paragraph he states as follows: "The advantages of denominational and interdenominational union in varying degrees have been demonstrated so often by well-meaning advocates that the public has accepted its desirability as an established fact and looks askance upon those who are not completely sold to the magical formula of its promoters. The words *denomination* and *sectarian* are anathematized by such persons as signs of archaic prejudice, which should be eliminated from the mental furnishings of modern thinkers and dropped from Christian vocabularies."

Sometimes, standing solitarily in the turbulent maelstrom of modern unionistic inundation, we, who endeavor to maintain confessional Christianity, are made to feel as if we were voices in the wilderness crying out in vain to a hardened and indifferent generation that simply cannot understand the vital issues for which we as loyal Bible Christians are contending. But articles like Dr. Brownell's convince us that also in outside circles the beauty and glory of honest, fearless confessionalism are still being recognized, and this encourages us to go on in the ancient fight of faith which the Lord has made both our duty and our privilege.

J. T. M.

On the Fifth Petition.—The following paragraphs from an article by Muriel Lester in the *Christian Century* furnishes food for thought. Kingsley Hall, mentioned by her, is a London social settlement. Recently the author toured Japan and China. While we cannot share her position, her words may engender some self-examination.

"I am afraid of the Lord's Prayer. For a number of years we

made a point of omitting it from our service at Kingsley Hall. The tremendous implication of each phrase may make it a means of danger as well as of blessing. To say, 'Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us,' is to make our own blessed release from guilt dependent upon our own ability to forgive. It is to say, 'Grant me that degree of forgiveness that I am willing to extend to my personal enemy.'

"A superrespectable neighbor in Bow refused to let me bring into her house a wretched woman who the previous week had been dragged out of a canal into which she had jumped as a refuge from anxiety and shame. I stared, amazed, at the householder. I knew she was one who said the Lord's Prayer regularly, yet here she was, hardening heart, mouth, and voice as she doggedly persisted in her refusal.

"Don't you really fear the prospect of losing God's forgiveness yourself?" I inquired with real concern. 'Honestly, doesn't the thought perturb you at all?' She looked at me wonderingly, as though the idea was a new one." A.

"The Revolt Against Religion."—This was the topic of the speech delivered by Roger Babson when he retired from the position of moderator of the Council of Congregational and Christian Churches. As reported in the *Christian Century*, Mr. Babson dwelt on a number of revolts which can be perceived in the ranks of church people and enumerated the following:

"1. A revolt against the present method of recording church-membership by the theory 'Once a member, always a member.' There is a demand for an annual reaffirmation.

"2. A revolt against hypocrisy among church-members. There is a demand that the standards for church-membership shall be raised, in order that it may mean more to be a church-member.

"3. A revolt against present inefficient Sunday-schools. There is a demand that the teaching be more serious and more applicable to the daily needs of the scholars.

"4. A revolt against ministers 'hogging' the middle of the week-end by saying, 'Go to church between 11 and 12 on Sunday morning or not at all.' There is a demand for multiple services—more services and shorter services.

"5. A revolt against 'intellectual religion.' There is a growing belief that one cannot save his soul without being 'born again.' There is demand for more sane return of evangelist revivals.

"6. A revolt against the prevalent custom of church committees' calling on their neighbors only when the church is raising money. There is a demand for the spirit of real stewardship within the church.

"7. A revolt against a few socialistic or capitalistic delegates at national church conclaves passing resolutions pretending to bind the entire membership.

"8. A revolt against the Church's being in business—through operating investment trusts, publishing concerns, and other financial activities.

"9. A revolt against the present wasteful competition between different Protestant denominations. Youth is demanding more rational

creeds and church consolidations. Youth is against denominationalism which is the support of paid officials and secretaries.

"10. A revolt against the Church's apparent lack of interest in the people's welfare. There is a demand that the Church at least do more to see that their own church families obtain employment."

Some of the revolts which Mr. Babson reports clearly are not justified; others, however, pertain to serious weaknesses and errors and should be given the most serious attention. A.

The Question Regarding the "Schwagerehe."—The Scripture-passages Lev. 18:16: "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife; it is thy brother's nakedness," and Lev. 20:21: "If a man shall take his brother's wife, it is an unclean thing; he hath uncovered his brother's nakedness: they shall be childless," have commonly been interpreted as prohibiting the so-called *Schwagerehe*; for since they do not impose the penalty of death, the prescribed penalty for adultery, the presumption is that the brother in the two cases is dead, so that the passages deal with what theological parlance has called *Schwagerehe*. Now, it has been contended that Jewish tradition did not so interpret the two passages; yet a pamphlet entitled *Judaism and Marriage* by Rabbi Felix A. Levy, Ph. D., Emanuel Congregation, Chicago (The Tract Commission, Merchants Building, Cincinnati), shows that Jewish interpretation in this case is in agreement with the old Lutheran exposition. The author writes: "The general practise of Reform Jews (following their interpretation of an old rabbinic adage that 'the law of the land is law') is to observe the prohibited degrees of the state. Where, however, the state permits and the Jewish law prohibits, as in the case of a woman wanting to marry her deceased husband's brother (except in cases of levirate marriage), Reform joins with Orthodoxy in condemning such unions and in instructing Rabbis not to solemnize them on the score of loyalty to the Jewish group and tradition. (Year-Book, C. C. A. R. XXXV, pp. 364 ff.)" *

Another paragraph in this pamphlet may be of interest to our pastors. We quote: "Mixed marriages, or unions between Jews and non-Jews, are discouraged by Judaism, the chief reasons being that differing religious views in the household are not conducive to the peace and harmony, love and understanding, that an intimate relationship such as marriage must foster. It has been the experience of the Jewish people that, when partners are of different faiths, the home will not be conducted Jewishly, and, in addition to other disadvantages, the children will not be reared as Jews. Judaism is the religion of a small minority, which can ill afford to weaken itself by loss of any of its members. Religions, like nations, have a natural anxiety to guard their hearths against loss by defection or desertion. If, however, the stranger embraces Judaism whole-heartedly and willingly joins the Jewish people, he or she is made welcome, and intermarriage may take place." (Pp. 11, 12.) Here we have the same problem facing our own denomination and the same motives that prompt us to warn against mixed marriages. To the writer it seems as if the case has been presented very convincingly. Only there must be added the question of salvation.

J. T. M.

* Italics our own.

Two-by-Twos.—Reports from Canada and from Illinois indicate that a new sect, known as Servants of God, Followers of Jesus, and Two-by-Twos, is causing disturbance in our congregations. The group has no official publication nor an official name. One of our pastors, Rev. Th. Dautenhahn, attended several meetings and discussed their religious program with the leaders. He submits the following: On the basis of Luke 10:1 their workers must go out by twos. In their literalism they forbid the building of churches. On the basis of Luke 10:7 they teach that the members should buy food and clothing for their ministers, who are to receive no salary. They condemn other denominations on no other ground than that they are named after some Christian leader.

Apparently the group is to be classified with some of the extreme Perfectionists. Some of them claim attainability of entire perfection. They reject infant-baptism. In their propaganda and proselyting they do not hesitate to slander other denominations, particularly the Lutherans. The ever-recurring refrain of their preaching centers is the theme: Surrender, submit, and yield to God. Enthusiasm, literalism, legalism, in short, a hopeless confusion of Law and Gospel, characterize this sect.

F. E. M.

The I AMs.—Los Angeles has become the hothouse of another weird cult. Mr. and Mrs. G. W. Ballard and son Donald claim to be the "accredited messengers" of a group of spirits whom they call the "ascended masters." These include Christ, Moses, and especially Saint-Germain, who appeared to Mr. Ballard on Mount Shasta, gave him a drink of "creamy liquid," and imparted to him the main doctrines concerning the "Mighty I AM Presence."

The Ballards claim 500,000 followers, hold meetings in California, Florida, Seattle, Chicago, St. Louis, etc., maintain the *Saint-Germain Press* (P. O. Box 1133, Chicago), and use the radio freely. The official magazine, *Voice of the I AM*, is published at 2600 South Hoover Street, Los Angeles.

The I AM is a conglomeration of Hinduism, Mazdaism, theosophy, and other Oriental philosophies. Every individual is said to have an I AM controlling influence. Light descends upon the individual from the great I AM above. When he realizes the presence of the great I AM, a purple flame enters him, and he is cleansed of his former embodiments (transmigration?). When perfection has been reached in man's self-improvement, ascension will follow. The perfect cleansing can be attained by mysticism and union with the deity. If, however, the purple flame is extinguished, death and further migrations will follow (karma, theosophy).

Saint-Germain is said to exert a beneficial influence on politics and economics. Social catastrophes are due to the rejection of Saint-Germain's instructions.

An eye-witness of a meeting of the "I AMs" at Los Angeles, reporting in the *Christian Century*, August 31, 1938, writes as follows:

"The Ballards assert that this movement is purely a patriotic, 'Save America' movement, as expressed on their bulletins: 'America needs your help as never before. The Ascended Masters offer their help and

full power of the Cosmic Lights as of a thousand suns for the protection of America and her people now. Individuals must wake up and make the call to the "Mighty I AM Presence," which enables the Ascended Masters to give this needed assistance.' At every meeting a so-called 'Decree' was shouted against the five most destructive agencies at work in America. These were named as spy activity, communist activity, labor agitation, dope activity, and war.

"The Leader says: 'Saint-Germain and Jesus have told us that in the silence the Great Power is generated, and the Spoken Word is the release of that power. So let us with all the earnestness at our command send out the Decrees which our beloved Masters have suggested.' Then follow such phrases as: 'Mighty Cosmic Light, come forth and do your perfect work; now the Forces of Light move into action with full power and are victorious; now the Light of God never fails, and the 'Mighty I AM Presence' is that Light; the limitless Legions of Light now sweep across the face of the earth, and all human darkness disappears,' etc."

F. E. M.

Brunner in Princeton. — Dr. Emil Brunner, professor at the University of Zurich, Switzerland, is teaching systematic theology (lectures on Christian doctrine) at Princeton Theological Seminary this year as "acting professor during the school-year, leaving open the permanent incumbency of the historic chair of the Hodges." This announcement is offered in the *Religious Digest* (September, 1938) in connection with an article on Brunner by John A. Mackay, president of Princeton Seminary (condensed from an article in the *Presbyterian Tribune*, May 26, 1938). In the article Dr. Mackay speaks of Brunner as "an outstanding religious thinker, who has played a major part in directing the thought of a generation steeped in historicism and subjectivism (rationalism and higher criticism) toward the eternal realities of the Christian faith." He comes to America as "a *Bible theologian*," "to whom the Bible has spoken as it did to Karl Barth, leading the two young friends and theologians into a new understanding of God and life." "His presence in America at the present time will be a mighty buttress to the efforts of the Supernaturalists of the Old School and the New to rehabilitate the Bible and Biblical thought into the place which they once occupied in the high places of American theology." "To say that Brunner is a Bible theologian means that the Bible is for him the record of the unique and absolute revelation of God and His redemptive purpose of mankind." "He believes in a God who has spoken in a final way to man and yet speaks to us still." "For Brunner the Bible is neither an oracle nor a divine thing in itself. The Bible is not to be worshiped in place of the God who speaks in and through the Book. The Bible may be treated idolatrously. It is paradoxically possible to be a 'Bible-believer' without being a 'Christian-believer' through a subtle substitution of a dogma about the Bible towards which one takes up an attitude of idolatrous devotion for loyal obedience to the living God who reveals Himself in the Bible." "As a Bible theologian Brunner welcomes the light of historical and scientific research upon all questions relating to the Biblical records and the interpretation of sections in the records where reverent objective research may help the Bible student."

These excerpts from Dr. Mackay's recommendation of Professor Brunner suffice to show that the latter is not a truly *Reformed* theologian in the sense of Calvin, the Hodges, Warfield, and other teachers at Princeton. To Brunner the Bible is not the Word of God as traditional Christian theology understands it, given by divine inspiration of the Holy Ghost and therefore inerrant in all its teachings from cover to cover. Brunner does not identify the Bible with the Word of God; the two are to him entirely different things. He therefore is an enthusiast of the same kind as those condemned in the Formula of Concord in the words: "Moreover, both the ancient and modern enthusiasts have taught that God converts men and leads them to the saving knowledge of Christ through His Spirit without any created means and instrument, that is, without the external preaching and hearing of God's Word." (Art. II, § 4. *Trigl.*, p. 881.) For this reason also Brunner does not deserve the epithet "Bible theologian"; for a true Bible theologian is a believing Christian who accepts the Bible as the verbally and plenarily inspired Word of God and therefore as the only source, norm, and rule of faith and life. Princeton Seminary is no longer that of the Hodges and Warfield, nor will the systematic theology of Brunner be that of these great defenders of verbal and plenary inspiration. J. T. M.

"Why I Am Not a Barthian." — Next to Dr. Mackay's cordial recommendation of Dr. Emil Brunner the *Religious Digest* offers to the reader an article with the heading just given, by Rev. L. De Moor, pastor of the North Blendon Reformed Church, Michigan. Dr. De Moor studied at Western Theological Seminary (Reformed), at Harvard, Hartford, and, 1930—1931, as a German exchange student, at the University of Marburg, Hesse, where he worked under Prof. Rudolph Bultmann, outstanding exponent of Barthianism, after which he spent a week in Bonn University, where he had an hour's conference with Dr. Barth himself. He heard Dr. Brunner some time ago in Harvard Divinity School, where the latter gave two lectures: "The Quest of Truth: Revelation," and "The Quest of Life: Salvation." In view of these facts his judgment is certainly of some weight, and his judgment of Brunner as a Christian theologian is entirely negative. Referring to Brunner's published lectures, entitled *The Theology of Crisis* (Scribner's, 1939), he says: "There I found Brunner using a two-edged sword with which he not only pursued Modernism but hacked away at 'orthodoxy' (to use his own word) as well. He sought to justify the latter attack on the ground that orthodoxy had made three mistakes: (1) It had 'tried to prove by historical arguments that Jesus was the God-man'; (2) In the theory of the verbal inspiration of the Bible it holds to a hopelessly uncritical and untenable position; (3) orthodoxy is wrong in claiming that in conversion 'a sinful man is actually transformed into a Christian man,' whereas 'the true Christian does not really exist; for while he is a Christian, he is and remains always a sinner, as the others who are not Christians.'" (De Moor's own italics.) Dr. De Moor continues as follows: "My main difficulties with Barthianism have been with its rejection of orthodoxy on the scores cited by Brunner immediately above. For me Barthianism means an untenable view of the Scriptures, an inadequate

doctrine of Christ, an impossible doctrine of salvation, and an invalid ethics. This is the same as saying that I find its doctrine of revelation unacceptable. . . . It is a fundamental tenet of Barthianism that the Bible contains the Word of God but that it is not the Word of God. Bible and Word of God are for them not synonymous. To use Barth's own words: 'God's Word happens (*geschieht*) also today in the Bible, but separated from this happening it is not the Word of God but a book like other books.' (*Dogmatik*, I, p. 63.) So that 'the sentence *The Bible is the Word of God* is an article of faith. The Bible is God's Word in as far as God allows it to be His Word, in as far as God speaks through it.' (*Dogmatik*, I, p. 63.) . . . Also, Brunner leaves us in no uncertainty that the *Crisis Theology* rejects any form of the verbal theory of inspiration when he writes that 'he who identifies the letters and the words of the Scriptures with the Word of God has never truly understood the Word of God. He who would know what constitutes the Word of God in the Bible must devote himself to Biblical criticism' and, let it be understood, to searching, fearless, radical criticism. For it is really the will of God that we shall hear His Word and not mistake ancient cosmology and Israelitish chronology for the Word of God! (*Theology of Crisis*, pp. 19, 20.) In view of such a conception of the Scriptures we ought not to be surprised, as some in orthodox circles appear to be, that Prof. Rudolph Bultmann of Marburg, one of the most radical Bible critics of our day, finds himself perfectly at home in Barthian circles and is, in fact, one of the leading exponents of the *Crisis Theology*. When, in conversation, I suggested to Barth that in orthodox circles there undoubtedly would be a readier acceptance of his theology if he would not give such free leash to extreme Biblical criticism, his rather impatient reply was, 'Aber das ist nun einmal so,' by which I understood him to mean that that was an inevitable eventuality to which all Christians must of necessity submit at the cost of being counted obscurantists."

The article is too long to be quoted in full at this place. Nowhere in its dogmatics is Barthianism orthodox Christianity, as this is declared in the ecumenical creeds of the Church. And yet Barthianism is trying to make people believe that it is trying to direct modern religious thought toward the eternal realities of the Christian faith; and even in liberal Lutheran circles this myth is being believed, as recent publications in the United Lutheran Church denying verbal inspiration and insisting upon radical criticism prove. J. T. M.

A Vagary of Dr. Barnhouse.—An article in the *Presbyterian* written by Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney presents some criticisms of a book by Dr. Barnhouse having the title *His Own Received Him Not, But*. As we see from the remarks of the critic, the author divides the years of the ministry of Jesus into two distinct parts. "In the first part He was approaching His own, the Jews. This period came to an abrupt conclusion, and after a definite break, when His own received Him not, He began offering the Gospel of grace to the whole world." The point where the cleavage comes is given Matt. 11:20, where Jesus pronounces the woes upon the cities that had received His message but had not repented. What Dr. Barnhouse wishes to bring out is that the Sermon

on the Mount belongs to the first period of the teaching of Christ and that hence it is addressed to the Jews and does not apply to the believers of today. "If we find things there which appear altogether inapplicable to our present life, such as complete non-resistance or a prayer for a forgiveness on the part of God measured by our forgiveness of one another, we are not to be troubled by them; for they are a part of the teaching of Jesus which was never intended for men today."

Dr. Barnhouse is a Dispensationalist, and we see from the view here alluded to what follies people who follow his system of Bible interpretation fall into. Criticizing the position of Dr. Barnhouse, Dr. Macartney says: "My first reaction is that this solution of admitted difficulties in the Sermon on the Mount is too easy and too artificial. If it is the true solution, then I wonder why Christ Himself or those appointed to teach in His name did not make this a little clearer for us. Is it possible that the Dispensationalists have been too eager to discover a solution of some of the New Testament problems?" In the remarks which follow we are struck especially by the cogency of the critic's reference to John 3:16, which great passage Jesus spoke in His early ministry and which certainly proclaims that His message was intended for the whole world. It is exegesis of Dr. Barnhouse's type which brings discredit upon theology.

A.

The Archbishop of York Argues for Close Communion. — Writing an article on the subject "Schism and the Sacraments," the editor of *Christendom*, Charles Clayton Morrison, discusses the argument for close Communion which is presented by the Archbishop of York. We quote Dr. Morrison: "The arguments against inter-Communion and close Communion have been drawn chiefly from the doctrine of the Church, the doctrine of a valid ministry, and the doctrine of the Lord's Supper itself. Stated very roughly, a Church which refuses Communion to any but its own members intends by so doing to assert one or more of three special claims: a special claim for itself as the true Church; or a special claim for its ministry as a true and valid ministry, competent to celebrate Communion with the efficaciousness which does not inhere in its celebration by other ministries; or a special claim for its conception of the meaning of the Lord's Supper (for example, transubstantiation, the presence, the sacrificial theory, and the like), which it holds to be so integral to the Eucharist that a Church would practise deception if it invited those to communicate who did not hold the particular conception held by the administrating Church.

"These have been the main lines of argument adopted by those who oppose inter-Communion, whether in the form of open Communion or of intercelebration. A new approach has now been made by the Archbishop of York, who brings forward the argument, which, so far as I am aware, has not found expression in any of the classic discussions of the Lord's Supper. Writing in the winter, 1938, number of *Christendom*, he passes by every one of the arguments mentioned above and opposes inter-Communion on the ground that as a Sacrament of the Church the Lord's Supper is an act of such a nature that it is meaningless to celebrate it in disunion — it can only be celebrated by a united body; it is the corporate act of such a body, and where there is no corporate body, there is

no Sacrament. According to the archbishop a service of inter-Communion is thus an attempt of disunited persons to perform an act which, in virtue of their disunion, they are incapable of performing. Such disunited persons, even though assembled in one place, are merely so many individuals. But the Lord's Supper is not an individual, personal act nor the act of a mere group of individuals but a corporate act of the Church, in which the corporate body offers itself to God and receives afresh in the bread and wine the body and blood of the Lord. The individual as a member of the Church participates in the corporate act of his Church and shares in the grace received; but the act is not his act but that of the Church, that is, the body of Christ. Both open Communion and inter-Communion thus, in effect, stultify the Sacrament. . . . Supported by the archbishop's argument, a Church may say: We do not practise inter-Communion; but that is not because our Church or our ministry or our doctrine is more true and valid than yours, but because we are all in disunion; when we are united in one body, we shall then, but not till then, be able to practise full Communion."

While one cannot agree with all the details here presented constituting the position of the Archbishop of York, Dr. Temple, there is no doubt that he is right when he holds that Holy Communion is intended to reflect the unity of those who commune. Cf. 1 Cor. 10:17. A.

Brief Items.—If anybody wishes to know what social gospel preachers with a world outlook dwell on, let him look at this set of themes on which Dr. Merton S. Rice of Detroit preached Sunday evenings during the past summer: China—the Human Potential; Japan—the Rampant Hermit; Russia—the Red Flag; Germany—the Racial Egotist; Italy—the Awakened Dream; Spain—Don against Don; Britain—the Lion's Share; France—the National Volcano; America—the Human Puzzle; God—the Hope of the Nations.

In Australia a movement is on foot to unite Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists. The United Church of Canada evidently is serving as a model.

Rome is steadily increasing its influence in parts of our country where several decades ago it was hardly known. While around 1900, as one of our exchanges points out, the southern part of our country saw but little of Catholicism, a Roman priest being a rare spectacle, and while those Catholics who had taken up their abode in Tennessee, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Georgia often had to travel many miles to attend one of their services, now the city of Memphis, to mention but one locality, has fourteen white and two colored Catholic parishes. The Paulist Fathers are said to be chiefly responsible for this advance, knowing how to adapt themselves to the ways and ideals of the Southern people, stressing what Roman Catholics and Protestants have in common and at times even using Protestant preachers to introduce them to a community. One accusation which cannot be fairly aimed at Roman Catholicism is that it lacks shrewdness.

A remark of Hitler's made in one of his speeches at Nuremberg in September has an ominous sound but perhaps should charitably be interpreted as expressing a refusal to mix Church and State. He is reported

to have said, "We [the Nazis] are not performing cultic rites, but organizing popular demonstrations. Men who would reveal to us the mysticism of the life beyond are not tolerated in our midst." We are willing to interpret this to mean that Hitler and his associates as Nazis sternly refuse to teach a religion.

According to the *News Bulletin* of the National Lutheran Council the per-capita contributions for benevolence during 1937 were: in the United Lutheran Church, \$2.32; in the American Lutheran Conference, \$2.62; in the Synodical Conference, \$2.65; in all other Lutheran bodies, \$1.49. The per-capita contributions, when all purposes are considered, amounted to: in the United Lutheran Church, \$14.59; in American Lutheran Conference, \$13.93; in the Synodical Conference, \$13.46; in all other Lutheran bodies, \$9.07. Before stating that Lutherans are worthy of high commendation as givers, one ought to read, as the *News Bulletin* correctly points out, what figures some other bodies can submit. The per-capita contributions for all purposes in the United Presbyterian Church were \$22.38; in the Southern Presbyterian Church, \$20.16; in the Church of the Nazarene, \$28.02; in the Moravian Church (North), \$20.33; in the Reformed Church in America, \$22.25; in the Northern Presbyterian Church, \$20.00. While we thank God for the moneys received in the Lutheran Church, the situation evidently is still far from ideal.

The Lutheran Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa., suffered the loss of one of its professors when Dr. Michael Hadwin Fischer died on August 7. He had been connected with the seminary since 1925, occupying the chair of Religious Education.

Two well-known German theologians died recently, Dr. Alfred Schmoller, known for his *Concordance of the Greek New Testament*, and Dr. Adolf Juelicher, whose *Introduction to the New Testament* has made his name familiar throughout the world. The latter was a modern theologian of the type of Harnack.

The following paragraph makes the rounds of the religious press: "Fifteen German Calvinists recently banished from Russia, when asked about religious conditions in Russia, reported: 'The Baptists are very strong in the villages, and the village believers have great influence and do great work among the Ukrainian people in the U. S. S. R. They go from house to house and often from village to village and persuade people to accept Christ as their personal Savior. In spite of all the persecution and the depression they remain strong and faithful to the Savior.'"

From England it was reported that Dr. Claude G. Montefiore, a Jewish scholar who devoted himself to the expounding of the New Testament, has died. Modernists considered his contributions very valuable. There is no doubt that his scholarship was profound. Unfortunately it did not lead him into the arms of Christ.

Do we fully visualize the poverty of some of our fellow-citizens? Of certain migrants in Texas moving about almost like fugitives and vagabonds, a reporter writes: "In one Texas county some six thousand of these migrants have just finished the gathering of onions, a two weeks' job. They lived in shabby tents, with no planned sanitation, receiving an average of 12 cents an hour for work in the fields—hard work,

bending over to the earth, filling and carrying sacks of the vegetable. At the end of the two weeks they moved on, carrying their families with them in the wheezing old auto or behind the poor old horses with which they once farmed until crop curtailment or foreclosure turned them off the land. In one town their camp was forcibly moved out into the country to prevent epidemic; in another several dozen families lived in a quarter block with neither water nor toilets. They went to the tomato fields of East Central Texas after the onions were picked and will next move on to berry patches or to the spinach gardens of the Rio Grande Valley, then into the cotton fields, which they will follow from South Texas through Oklahoma into Arkansas."

The following poem, printed in the *Presbyterian*, about a symbolical Dr. Learned Aloof may not contain the portrait of any reader of these lines, but the warning it echoes may well be heeded by every one of us.

A parish-priest of austerity
 Climbed up in a high church-steeple
 To be nearer God than he might find
 His Word down to the people.

And in sermon script he daily wrote
 What he thought was sent from heaven,
 And he dropped it down on the people's heads
 Two times one day in seven.

In his age God said, "Come down and die,"
 And he cried out from his steeple,
 "Where art Thou, Lord?" and the Lord replied,
 "Down here, among My people!"

Union Sunday evening services in Pittsburgh have not proved a success. Twenty-three Protestant churches agreed to unite their efforts Sunday evenings and hold one service in Carnegie Hall. While the hall seats 2,200 people, the audiences did not number more than one thousand, a report says.

Sir Arthur Eddington, Plumer Professor of Astronomy, Cambridge University, England, recently was honored by the King, who conferred the Order of Merit on him. Sir Arthur is favorably known as an opponent of the mechanical view of the universe sponsored by Herbert Spencer and other thoroughgoing evolutionists.

Was Babson right in his criticism of American church-life? The *Christian Century*, reporting on the completion of his term as moderator of the General Council of the Congregational and Christian Churches, says, "He was trying to formulate a feeling which is widespread throughout American Protestantism. This is the feeling that church-life is suffering from the multiplication of denominational machinery, that religious vitality is lost amid the grinding of an Ezekiel-like phantasmagoria of wheels within wheels, that the resources of the Church are being exhausted in an effort to support a constantly proliferating denominational overhead. In so far as Mr. Babson's crusade represented a protest against this tendency, it voiced a genuine and pervasive Protestant misgiving." Naturally, we protest against such a reference to the grand vision of Ezek. 1; but apart from this, let everybody ask himself whether the attitude ascribed here to Babson is not founded on facts.

A.

II. Ausland

„Die biblische Grundlage der Prädestinationslehre bei Calvin.“ So lautet das Thema eines Vortrags, den Peter Barth am 15. Juni 1936 auf dem dritten Kongreß für calvinistische Theologie in Genf gehalten und in der Zeitschrift „Evangelische Theologie“ (Juli 1938, S. 159 ff.) veröffentlicht hat. Zunächst wird die Lehre Calvins dargestellt. „Der Text [der *Institutio*] von 1539 bringt die genaue Definition, wie Calvin die Prädestination verstanden wissen will. Prädestination nennen wir das ewige Dekret Gottes, nach dem er bei sich beschloffen hat, was mit einem jeden einzelnen Menschen geschehen sollte. Denn nicht alle werden mit der gleichen Bestimmung (*pari conditione*) geschaffen, sondern den einen wird das ewige Leben, den andern die ewige Verdammnis vorausverordnet. Daher sagen wir, je nach dem einen oder andern Ziel, auf das hin ein Mensch geschaffen ist, er sei zum Leben oder zum Tode prädestiniert.“ (Kap. 21, 5.) . . . Nach diesem Exkurs der Schlußredaktion (von 1539) fährt der alte Text von 1539 wieder fort mit seinen harten, unerbittlichen Feststellungen: Wir sagen also, was die Schrift klar zeigt, daß Gott nach ewigem und unveränderlichem Ratsschluß ein für allemal festgesetzt hat, welche er einst einmal zum Heile annehmen, welche er dem Verderben weihen wolle. Wir sagen, daß dieser Ratsschluß in bezug auf die Erwählten in seinem unerbittlichen Erbarmen begründet sei, ohne Rücksicht auf menschliche Würdigkeit. Welchen aber die Verdammung verordnet wird, denen werde durch sein zwar gerechtes und unwiderrufliches, aber auch unbegreifliches Urteil der Weg zum Leben verschlossen.“ (Kap. 21, 7.) . . . In der Schlußredaktion geht Calvin auf den Einwand ein, die Schrift sage dies nirgendwo ausdrücklich, daß Adam auf Gottes Dekret hin gefallen sei. Er hält dem entgegen, Gott, der nach Ps. 115, 3, machen kann, was er will, könne sein vornehmstes Geschöpf doch nicht mit ungewissem Lebensziel geschaffen haben. Wo bliebe Gottes Allmacht, wenn Gott nichts anderes bestimmt habe, als den mit freiem Willen ausgerüsteten Menschen je nach Verdienst zu behandeln? Die Schrift bezeuge jedenfalls laut, daß in der Person des einen Menschen alle Sterblichen dem ewigen Tode verhaftet worden seien, 1 Kor. 15, 21. Da dies nicht der Natur zugeschrieben werden könne, sei es offenkundig, daß dies durch Gottes wunderbaren Ratsschluß geschehen sei. Dann müsse aber auch der Fall Adams selber durch Gottes Ratsschluß erfolgt sein. „Wieso ist es geschehen“, fragt Calvin, „daß der Fall Adams so viele Völkerschaften zusammen mit ihren Kindern rettungslos in den ewigen Tod verstrickte, wenn nicht, weil es Gott so gefallen hat? Hier müssen die sonst so geschwätzigen Zungen schweigen.“ Calvin bekennt an dieser Stelle selbst: „*Decretum quidem horribile, fateor*; ich bekenne, ein schauerliches Dekret!“ (Kap. 23, 7.) . . . Noch einmal kommt die Verstoßung und Verwerfung der andern in erneuter unerbittlicher Härte zur Sprache, Kap. 24, 12—17. Hart zu schaffen geben ihm die von seinen katholischen und evangelischen Gesprächspartnern zäh ins Feld geführten Schriftstellen: „Gott will nicht den Tod des Sünders, sondern daß er sich bekehre und lebe“, Hesek. 33, 11. 1 Tim. 2, 4; Sach. 1, 3; Röm. 11, 32. Calvin bleibt aber mit seinem Bundesgenossen Augustin allen Einsprüchen gegenüber bei seinem „*ceterum censeo*“: „O Mensch, wer bist du, daß du mit Gott rechten willst?!“ . . .

„Wir treten nun an die schwere und ernste Aufgabe, Calvins Lehre von der Prädestination auf ihre Übereinstimmung mit der Schrift hin zu prüfen. Wir wären schlechte Calvinisten, wir würden das Bekenntnis unserer reformierten Väter zur alleinigen Autorität der Schrift verleugnen, wollten wir es nun einfach bei der ehrfürchtigen Beugung unter die Autorität des Reformators bewenden lassen. Wir sind uns darüber einig, daß Calvin unter den Lehrern der Kirche an hervorragender Stelle steht. . . . Wir sind nun auch verpflichtet, in aller Freiheit auch einem Calvin gegenüber, in der Schrift zu forschen, ob es sich also verhielte', Apost. 17, 11. . . . Wie kommt Calvin zu dieser Feststellung? Er gibt zwei Quellen dafür an: die Schrift und die Erfahrung. Wir fragen zu der zweiten Erkenntnisquelle: Ist unsere menschliche Erfahrung kompetent, hier irgendeine Aussage zu machen, und lassen sich aus ihren Aussagen irgendwelche Schlußfolgerungen ziehen? Wir ließen uns von der ersten *Institutio* belehren, daß wir uns in *concreto* niemals die Feststellung einer endgültigen Verworfenheit anmaßen sollten, was Calvin auch in seiner Lehre von der Kirche dauernd festgehalten hat. Was vermag uns also unsere Erfahrung, und wäre es Menschheitserfahrung in der Richtung der doppelten Prädestination zu sagen?“ (Vgl. F. Pieper, *Chr. Dog.*, III, S. 564.) „Wie steht es aber mit der ersten Erkenntnisquelle für die Feststellung der doppelten Prädestination, mit der Heiligen Schrift? Sagt die Heilige Schrift wirklich das aus, was Calvin als unbestreitbare Schriftwahrheit versteht: die vor Schöpfung der Welt dekretierte und unveränderliche Prädestination der einen zum Leben, der andern zum Tod? Calvin ist sich bewußt — das läßt sich aus dem Text der *Institutio* belegen —, daß er zu dem einen Dekret, dem *decretum horribile* der Verwerfung, durch keine direkte Schriftausage gelangt, sondern durch eine Schlußfolgerung, Kap. 23, 3. Gibt es Erwählung — in dem von ihm genau definierten prädestinationischen Sinn —, so muß es auch Verwerfung, vor Schöpfung der Welt erfolgte Prädestination zum ewigen Verderben, geben. (Cf. Kap. 23, 1.) Wir lassen es dahinstehen, ob es menschlichem Denken — denn das ist diese Schlußfolgerung auf alle Fälle — zusteht, von einer auch noch so sicheren Prämisse aus zur Behauptung eines solchen göttlichen Dekretes, dieses Dekretes, überzugehen.“ (Vgl. Pieper, *op. cit.*, S. 559.)

Unerwarteterweise aber heißt es nun in unserm Artikel weiter: „Wir konzentrieren uns auf die Frage: Wie verhält sich das Zeugnis der Schrift zu der Prämisse? Bezeugt uns die Heilige Schrift das Walten und das Werk des göttlichen Erbarmens an unserer dem Tod verfallenen Welt im Sinne einer vor Erschaffung der Welt festgelegten Vorausbestimmung einer scharf umgrenzten Auswahl bestimmter Menschen zum ewigen Heil (bei ebenso strikter Vorausbestimmung der andern zum Untergang)?“ Die Prädestination zur Verdammnis wird hier mit Recht verworfen. Will der Verfasser aber den Satz stehenlassen, daß es eine Gnadenwahl gibt, daß Gott „uns“, bestimmte Menschen, aus Gnaden erwählt, „auserwählt“, hat zum ewigen Leben und daß diese Wahl nicht fehlen kann? Es scheint, daß er sich in der Ausführung nicht so recht entschieden dazu bekennen will. E.

Book Review — Literatur

A Shepherd Remembers. By Leslie D. Weatherhead. The Abingdon Press, New York. 176 pages, 7½×5. Price, \$2.00.

Here is a new appraisal of the Twenty-third Psalm by the pastor of the City Temple in London, who spent considerable time during the World War as a political officer among the Arab tribes on the Persian border. His purpose is plainly described in the preface: "What I have tried to do is to paint the picture which lies behind each phrase in the psalm and then interpret its meaning in the fuller light we have in Jesus, the Good Shepherd." In a general way, the author has met this objective, although we believe that the emphasis on Christ as the Good Shepherd, who lays down His life for His sheep, could be stronger and more consistent.

Unfortunately the presentation is marred by unnecessary concessions to higher criticism. Thus the superscription "A Psalm of David" to the author means "that the psalm was taken from the first of the minor psalters gathered under the name of David, the traditional father of religious poetry." (P.17.) This denial of the Davidic authorship and the substitute theory, of course, is not original with Pastor Weatherhead. He cites the *International Critical Commentary* on the Psalms by Briggs and accepts his peculiar theory of authorship.

The presentation creates the impression that the Biblical text of the Old Testament is unsound, and the author is ready to correct the Masoretic text on the basis of the Septuagint manuscripts. For example, on page 106 he says: "The verse in Ps.2:9, translated 'Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron' should be read: 'Thou shalt shepherd them with an iron club,'"—an utterly unwarranted emendation based on a Septuagintal error, with a resultant fantastic translation. Again, the author makes long linguistic leaps in such statements as these: "The word 'friend' in the Old Testament comes usually (not always) from the root of the word for 'shepherd.'" A glance at Gesenius will show that the two words are derived from homonymic, yet different, roots.

The author seeks to retain the shepherd picture in the last part of the psalm with about as much success to our mind as any other attempt. A notable feature in the book is the well-selected sepia pictures from the American Colony in Jerusalem illustrating Palestinian shepherd life.

W. A. MAIER

The World in which Jesus Lived. By Basil Mathews. The Abingdon Press, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 130 pages, 5¼×8. Price, \$1.50.

The book, as the blurb says, is written for those who have not seen the Bible lands or people, for those who would equip themselves as Bible teachers, and for those who would prepare for a visit to the Near East. Having during twenty years repeatedly visited Palestine, the author is well equipped to describe the land in which Jesus lived among men and with the aid of this background to picture to us the life of the Jews in the days of Christ. These are the headings of the chapters:

Jesus' World and Ours; The Life of the Home; The Drama of Every Day; His Native Land; The Panorama of His People; The Greek Way of Life; The Roman Eagles; Paul: Hebrew Orator, Greek Writer, Roman Citizen; Paul's Pictures from Life."

The book furnishes much interesting, helpful information, assisting one in the endeavor of understanding the picture language of the gospels. Now and then a feeling of uneasiness arises in one as to the scholarship of the author. It was not, as the uninitiated reader has to conclude, Antiochus the Great who was responsible for the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem (p. 74 f.); nor was Baruch the coworker of the prophetess Deborah (p. 63); nor did Cyrus of Persia bring his armies west to fight the *Greeks* (p. 44). One is amazed to read (p. 125) that the high priest carried a dove or lamb into the Holy of Holies. These are, of course, mere little slips or inaccuracies which can easily be deleted in a second edition.

In the chapter on "Paul's Pictures from Life" we find these beautiful sentences on the meaning of reconciliation (the Scripture reference being 2 Cor. 5:18 f.): "God makes my relation to Him right through Christ and gives me the work of bringing others into that relationship of love and understanding; God, not reckoning that I have not contributed my share, has canceled that debt and actually trusts me with expressing to the world His longing to bring all His children into a relationship of love with Himself." (P. 121.) Justification is correctly and forcefully portrayed as a forensic act (p. 123). But when the word propitiation is explained the moral-influence theory is adopted (p. 125), and the doctrine of the substitutionary atonement, although not quite adequately described, is rejected. How this view of propitiation is to be harmonized with the author's teaching concerning reconciliation mentioned before is hard to see.

W. ARNDT

God the Creator. By Geo. S. Hendry. The Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn. 170 pages, 5¼×7¼. Price, \$1.50.

The Eternal Gospel. By Rufus M. Jones. The Macmillan Company, New York. 235 pages, 5¼×8. Price, \$2.00.

The pulpit pronouncements in our American (sectarian) churches are generally no more than a faint echo of the modern books on theology (alas, often falsely so called) which their ministers read, so that we can rightly understand modern American preaching only if we keep in touch with the present-day book markets. From this point of view the two volumes here reviewed are of interest also to us Missourians. The first, *God the Creator*, contains five lectures which the Rev. Prof. G. S. Hendry, associate professor of divinity, University of Edinburgh and the Hastie Lecturer at the University of Glasgow, delivered in 1935. His guiding thesis finds its expression in the presentation of the non-immanent, "wholly-other" God, whom Barth (Brunner) has been preaching Germany and Switzerland as a challenge to German Ritschlians to restudy the doctrine of God as this is set forth especially in the great church creeds and in the writings of the Reformers (as Barth, so also Hendry includes the Swiss divines). The lectures do not make easy or

popular reading but are intended for such only as are interested in, and conversant with, Barthian fundamentals. To all who have the requisite historico-theological background, as also the desire for theological research, they make fascinating reading. The lecturer, of course, is orthodox only in a Barthian sense. On the one hand, he stoutly disavows the vague pantheistic concept of God which Continental and British divines now champion; on the other hand, while seeking his *terminus a quo* in the theology of the Reformation, he does not turn entirely to Christian orthodoxy in expounding the doctrine of God. Like Barth's, so also his investigations terminate in a sort of philosophy of theology rather than in a *theologia pura et e Scriptura hausta*. He begins his lectures with the problem of the knowledge of God, then pictures, in a somewhat sweeping way, the God of Israel and the deities of Greece in their fundamental divergences, next brings them together in a supposed "great amalgamation," or fusion, of God-concepts, then presents in a long chapter—and this is the best portion of the book—Luther's "theology of the Godhead of God," seen of course through Barth's colored spectacles, and finally endeavors to analyze the Christian knowledge of God the Creator in its fundamental aspects. Studies of this kind are by no means useless. They at least show us orthodox theologians how eminently well we are off because we take our theological knowledge directly out of the Bible and confine it to what Scripture teaches in so many clear words, there resting the case. In this way we obtain the divine truth concerning God and a very definite, certain, and helpful divine truth, while rationalizing Barthians and their fellows "wax worse and worse," *πλανῶντες καὶ πλανώμενοι*, 2 Tim. 3:13, "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth," v. 7. The book is full of striking judgments and sayings, such as the following: "God must now pass a test, set by human thought (modernistic thought of course), before He can be accorded to be God." (P. 134.) Or: "He [Luther] is entirely innocent of the 'Zug zum System'" (p. 118), which indeed is very good. Or: "To identify empirical method with scientific method is quite unscientific." (P. 21.) Or: "Reason comes a litigant, but it constitutes itself the judge, and faith in consequence is rationalized." (P. 15.) Professor Hendry avows in his Preface that "Scottish theology has to find its true affinity with the theology of Continental Protestantism rather than with that of England or America." To this profession he is moved, we believe, by the painful shallowness of English and American modernistic theologians, which is in no wise pleasing to the profounder Edinburgh divines.—In his treatise Professor Hendry speaks of the present-day "vogue of mysticism." *The Eternal Gospel*, by Rufus M. Jones, offers a sample of this modern religious mysticism. Dr. Jones, formerly professor of philosophy at Haverford College, kept (as we are told) in close touch with leading mystics of Europe ever since he studied in Heidelberg some fifty years ago. Also in this book Barthian influences are traceable. The "old devil" of enthusiasm in his book is not so very different from that of the Barthians, though wearing another kind of garment. To Philosopher Jones the "eternal Gospel" is the "direct revelation of God to men through the coming, and the

presence in the world, of the Holy Spirit" (p. 1). This is the definition of the "eternal Gospel," which mystic monk Joachim a Fiori suggested in the twelfth century, and Dr. Jones adopts it as quite pertinent. He himself interprets the "eternal Gospel" as the "endless revelation to men of a spiritual Reality who is over all and in all and at the same time vastly more than all things in space and time, a Reality, both immanent and transcendent, as Spirit in its essential nature is bound to be." After the fashion of mystics in general he next traces the "revelation of the eternal Gospel" through the ages, in history, the Church, literature, and so forth, until he arrives at the conclusion that "the world is still in the making" and that "God is still 'making man,'" "creation being yet in progress." Professor Jones's attack is upon (atheistic) Humanism and materialism, which grossly dethrone God and seek to get along without Him. But Jones's mysticism is no remedy against atheism in any form. It is no more than a pantheistic (evolutionistic) acknowledgment of an existing world force conceived as "God," very similar to Schleiermacher's. We are somewhat perplexed that this book is the first to appear in a so-called *Great Issues of Life Series*, which is to be published soon. Books of this sort contribute nothing helpful in support of positive Christianity. It rather represents antichristianism and essentially the same brand which Humanism champions. Mysticism, both ancient and modern, is nothing else than *merus enthusiasmus* (eitel Enthusiasmus), and what Luther so well writes in his fine Smalcald Articles (Part III, Art. VIII, §§ 5, 6) is true also of the "sheer enthusiasm," which Rufus M. Jones here represents: "All this is the old devil and old serpent, who also converted Adam and Eve into enthusiasts and led them from the Word of God to spiritualizing and self-conceit (auf Schwarmgeisterei und Eigenduenkel)." (Triglot, p. 495.)

J. THEODORE MUELLER

Der französische Protestantismus. Sein Weg bis zur französischen Revolution. Von Joseph Chambron. 1937. Chr.-Kaiser-Verlag, München. 210 Seiten. Preis: geheftet: RM. 3.80; gebunden: RM. 5.

Der Verfasser dieses Buches, Abkomme eines alten Hugenottengeschlechts, will die innere Geschichte des französischen Protestantismus zeichnen. Er hat sein Buch „aus der Tradition seiner Vorfahren, aus dem Geiste der Urkunden und aus der Seele des Volkes und der Landschaft heraus geschrieben“. Er will zeigen, daß die Geschichte der Reformation in Frankreich nicht auf politisch-militärische Ereignisse, sondern auf Grund der französischen Geistes- und Kulturgeschichte aufgebaut werden muß. Das könnte eine etwas einseitige Abhandlung erwarten lassen; tatsächlich ist sie nicht einseitig, sondern schenkt beiden Seiten gebührende Aufmerksamkeit. Freilich, den Schlußfolgerungen kann man nicht immer beistimmen. Wenn er behauptet, die französische Reformation unterscheide sich so von der deutschen, daß in Deutschland sich die Fürsten zuerst für das Evangelium erklärt hätten und ihren Untertanen vorangegangen seien, während in Frankreich einzelne, meist einfache Menschen des Volkes, zum Heilsglauben gekommen,auerzeitig ihr Land mit dem Evangelium durchseht hätten, so ist letzteres wahr; aber ersteres läßt sich nicht halten. Die Römischen möchten das — o wie gerne! — feststellen, daß die Reformation in deutschen Landen dem Volk von den Fürsten aufgezwungen worden sei und daß die Fürsten natürlich die

Reformation hätten einführen wollen aus Ghabgier, um die Kirchengüter an sich zu reißen. Daß es solche Fälle gab, wird niemand bestreiten; in der Regel aber wuchs auch in Deutschland die Reformation aus dem Volke heraus. In der Folge zeigt sich dann freilich die Einwirkung der ganz verschiedenen Staatsverfassung in beiden Ländern. Wenn Chambon weiter behauptet, daß in Frankreich die Auseinanderziehung mit der römischen Kirche nur eine Begleitmelodie im eigentlichen Kampfe sei und der entscheidende Bedränger das vergöttlichte Königtum war, das nicht nur über Fleisch und Blut, sondern auch über die Seelen herrschen wollte, so ist das richtig, aber wieder nur die halbe Wahrheit. Wenn später in der französischen Revolution Königtum und Kirche in einen Haufen geworfen und miteinander abgeschafft wurden, so hatte das seinen Grund in jahrhundertelanger Geschichte; die beiden hatten je und je zusammengehalten. Niemand hatte mehr zur „Vergöttlichung“ des Königtums beigetragen als die „Kirche“, weil es ihr dort in ihren Kram paßte. Was bewog Franz I. dazu, gegen seine eigene Neigung die erste Verfolgung des Protestantismus ins Werk zu setzen? Es wurde ihm klargemacht, daß er es sich in jenen unruhigen Zeiten nicht leisten dürfe, sich die „Kirche“ zum Feinde zu machen. Wer war schuld daran, daß das Toleranzedikt von 1787 nicht schon 1598 datiert werden konnte? Wer überzeugte Louis XIV., daß er als Sühne für seinen bisherigen ausschweifenden Wandel das Edikt von Nantes widerrufen müsse? Madame de Maintenon? Aber die hatte das nicht selbst erfunden; das befahl die „Kirche“. Die „Kirche“ hätte gar zu gerne zu demselben Zweck in Deutschland das Kaiserium „vergöttlicht“; dort scheiterte es aber wieder an der verschiedenen Regierungsverfassung, unter der der Kaiser ohne seine Fürsten schier machtlos war.

Man möchte so das ganze Buch durchadern; es ist überaus anregend. Es ist ein „Buch voll Blut und Tränen“. In einem kurzen einleitenden Kapitel erzählt der Verfasser die Vorgeschichte der Reformation in Frankreich; schildert die schrecklichen Zustände in der Kirche; „die bürgerlichen Mütter verkaufen ihre Töchter an reiche kirchliche Würdenträger, um zunächst eine Mitgift für den späteren legalen Gatten herauszuschlagen; in der Provinz geht das gräßliche Wort um: „Schon der Schatten eines Franziskanerkloster-Kirchturms macht die Frauen der Umgebung schwanger“; Kardinal Jean von Lothringen vereinigt in seiner Person zwölf Erzbistümer und Bistümer und bietet so „die ungeheuerliche Erscheinung eines wandelnden Konzils in der Person eines einzigen freisinnigen Lebemanns“. Dann ein Kapitel über die Renaissance in Frankreich mit Charakterstizzen des Poeten Marot, der Königin Margarete von Navarra und des Franziskanermönchs Rabelais, der ein wenig Zura studierte, dann Arzt wurde und schließlich „Priester“ einer kleinen Gemeinde, „um die er sich weder als Pfarrer noch als Arzt viel gekümmert hat“. Das dritte Kapitel, die Reformation, schildert das Werk Lesebrees, die Bedeutung Luthers für die Reformation in Frankreich, die viel zu kurz abgemacht wird, die Meuz-Bewegung, die Wirksamkeit Farel's, die Jugendgeschichte Calvins und seinen Einfluß auf Frankreich, eine schauerliche Beschreibung der Verfolgungen unter Franz I. und Heinrich II. und endet mit der Gründung der protestantischen Kirche Frankreichs auf der Synode von Paris, 1559. Kapitel 4, die Gegenreformation, von Amboise aus mit seinem Schauspiel „zur Unterhaltung der Damen“, zu dem der runde Turm des Schlosses mit abgehauenen Köpfen hingerichteter Menschen und an Striden und Ketten hängenden Leichen, wie Marionetten, geschmückt ist, durch die Religionskriege mit der perfiden „Schaufelpolitik“ Katharinas von Medici, die Bar-

tholomäusnacht mit der vorbereitenden Arbeit Pius' V., demgegenüber „Alexander VI. ein Verbrecher pro domo“ ist, bis zur Ermordung Heinrichs III. und Heinrichs IV. Vetterem wird dann noch ein besonderes Kapitel gewidmet. Kapitel 6 beschreibt die Amtszeit Richelieus und Mazarins und bereitet vor das Sterben des französischen Protestantismus (Kap. 7) unter Louis XIV. und schildert die Aufhebung des Edikts von Nantes mit der begleitenden schrecklichen Verfolgung und dem Kamisardkrieg. Schließlich bringt das letzte Kapitel die Gründung der „Kirche der Wüste“, die bis 1752 bitter verfolgt wird, bis schließlich 1787 Louis XVI. das Toleranzedikt erläßt.

Ein Buch voll Blut und Tränen! Man lese und bedenke, daß der Mohr nur schwerlich seine Haut wandelt noch der Barber seine Fleden.

Theo. Söyer

George Whitefield, the Matchless Soul-Winner. By Edwin Noah Hardy, Ph. D. American Tract Society, New York, N. Y. 298 pages, 5½×7¾. Price, \$1.50. May be ordered through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

The author has written a fascinating and instructive biography of the founder of Calvinistic Methodism, the inaugurator of the greatest and withal the most evangelical revival sweeping the British Isles and America. Of feeble health, yet indomitable in his zeal to preach Christ and Him crucified to a world steeped in sin and iniquity, Whitefield preached almost every day, in cathedrals and in the open field, at the bedside of the ailing and dying and before vast multitudes numbering twenty to thirty thousand, to sailors on shipboard, to hardened criminals in prison, to outcasts in the slum districts, to blue-blooded aristocrats in the drawing-room of Lady Huntington, to pleasure-seekers at amusement places, invariably preaching repentance and faith in Christ Jesus, the Son of God. Though one deplors his Calvinistic and unionistic persuasions, one cannot read the book without catching some of the enthusiasm animating this winner of souls and praying God that He would fill the hearts of all our preachers and laymen with that intense love of souls characterizing George Whitefield.

TH. LAETSCH

Up to Now. By Charles Forbes Taylor. Fleming H. Revell, New York. 140 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, \$1.50.

The autobiography of a modern "evangelist," who began his career when three and a half years old by singing "Jesus Loves Me" while his father was conducting a meeting and who accompanied the singing of the congregation by whistling. The book is priced rather high.

TH. LAETSCH

2500 Best Modern Illustrations. By Rev. G. B. F. Hallock, M. A., D. D. Harper and Brothers, New York and London. 413 pages. Price, \$1.00.

Dr. Hallock has compiled a number of volumes of illustrations for sermons and addresses. For a number of years he was also editor of *Doran's Minister's Manual*. Among the thousands of incidents, myths, anecdotes, fables, legends, etc., which are contained in these volumes, there are no doubt some that are worthy and appropriate; but with these there are many more which are definitely not of that description. Quite

a number of the latter are silly or even misleading. Some may be used in an after-dinner speech or in an address upon an occasion which admits of humor. In this connection it may be repeated what has been said at other times: Good illustrations are certainly a valuable part of a sermon. But good illustrations which are fitting and striking are not easy to find. Not a few preachers therefore have used poor, trite, and even banal material. And now, because this illustrating of sermons with anecdotes, stories, myths, and fables has been overdone in quantity and underdone in quality, some ministers have almost entirely discontinued the use of illustrations. That is also a mistake. The Bible itself is full of the finest illustrations. Nor are they trite or too well known. It is true, there are some that we have heard and read repeatedly in our churches and in our literature, but there are many others which we have never heard and which we have never read, although we have read and heard no small number of sermons. It is with this matter of illustrations as it is with polemics. Polemics, properly handled, is a necessary, interesting, and powerful ingredient of a sermon. If you remove polemics from the teachings of Jesus, from the letters of Paul, or from the writings of Luther, much of their most valuable material is lost. But polemics must be carefully handled. If improperly used, the pastor will be condemned for "knocking other churches." In polemics the preacher must so arrange matters that his people are filled with indignation against that which he condemns as false, untrue, and misleading.

But to return to illustrations. Dwight L. Moody, whom we heard repeatedly, was a master in the use of apt and telling illustrations. His personality, manner, diction, and delivery also were exactly adapted to his narratives. To the young pastor who is to increase in this ability of illustrating the truth no better advice can be given than that he carefully study the Bible and note the illustrations which the holy men of God moved by the Holy Spirit have used. He need not on this account despise a good anecdote or historical incident which may be utilized for this purpose. He may therefore consult such a volume as that of Dr. Hallock's. Let him remember, however, that good taste, sound judgment, and rare tact are necessary for the proper selection and arrangement of a preacher's illustrations. Even pastors may momentarily forget that there is no source of illustrations superior to Holy Writ. Such men may buy expensive books and for the time being overlook the best Book of illustrations right upon their desk. We must all daily guard against gazing aloft and afar while forgetting what precious things are right *ante pedes*. We must watch over ourselves lest we be of those to whom other men's pastures are always the greener and to whom "distance lends enchantment to the view." Remember Aesop's dog, who dropped his meat and snapped at a shadow. Not only our people need more Bible-study, — we preachers need more of it. Nothing else can so enrich and improve our sermons as a prayerful, systematic, and persistent study of the words of those holy men who wrote the thoughts and words inspired by Him of whom it was said: "Never man spake like this Man," John 7:46.

MARTIN S. SOMMER

Die Freude am Herrn unsre Stärke. Predigten von Hermann Bezzel. D. Gundert Verlag, Stuttgart. 127 Seiten 4x6. Preis: Kartontiert RM. 1.10; Leinen RM. 1.40.

Wieder ein prächtiges Büchlein, welches zur Genüge beweist, daß drüben im Heimatlande Luthers die Schriftlehre noch gelehrt wird. Bezzel ist ein schriftgläubiger Prediger, der an die Erlösung durch Christi Blut glaubt. Er ist Meister einer schönen, bilderreichen Sprache, vielleicht für unsere hiesigen Verhältnisse etwas schwer zu verstehen, aber für jeden, der die deutsche Sprache noch lieb hat, sehr ansprechend. Nur hin und wieder finden sich Abirrungen, wie wenn der Verfasser (S. 32) sagt: „Aber doch glaube ich, daß der Herr in seiner Heidenwelt auch ohne Mission alle Suchenden in Todesnöten tröstet; denn er ist treu.“ Und es ist zum mindesten fraglich, ob Paulus den Philipperbrief im Angesichte des Todes geschrieben hat. (S. 82.) Aber ein Prediger kann sich an Bezzels Betrachtungen bilden, sowohl was Inhalt als was Sprache anlangt. P. E. R e h m a n n

How to Organize and Conduct a Meeting. By W. M. Henry and Dr. L. Seeley. 133 pages, 5¼x7½. Noble and Noble, New York. Price, \$1.50. May be ordered through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

This book, as the publishers state, “provides a manual of parliamentary law that is as authoritative as *Roberts’ Rules of Order* or *Cushing’s Manual*, but is written in a simplified manner and organized in topical paragraphs for use in schools and colleges.” It will prove valuable to our pastors also. The author offers chapters on Parliamentary Law, How to Conduct a Meeting, Duties and Rights of Members, Rules of Order, Order of Business and of Debate, Discussion of a Question, Privileged Questions and Work of Committees, also a form for a constitution and by-laws and forms for various resolutions and reports. A good index facilitates the use of the book.

TH. LAETSCH

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a “fine” on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us—one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. “Nov 38” on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.